



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, MARCH 9, 2015

No. 39

## House of Representatives

The House was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Tuesday, March 10, 2015, at 12 noon.

## Senate

MONDAY, MARCH 9, 2015

The Senate met at 2 p.m. and was called to order by the Honorable TOM COTTON, a Senator from the State of Arkansas.

### PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Our Father in Heaven, clothed in dazzling splendor, we bow our hearts in Your presence. You are our helper, our defender, and our refuge. You are our hope for years to come.

Strengthen our Senators for today's challenges. Direct their thoughts, words, and actions, enabling them to follow Your leading. Lord, use them to transform dark yesterdays into bright tomorrows. Give them peace during turbulent moments and a faith that will not shrink under pressure. Make their words fountains of light.

We pray in Your sacred Name. Amen.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

### APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,  
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,  
Washington, DC, March 9, 2015.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable TOM COTTON, a Senator from the State of Arkansas, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ORRIN G. HATCH,  
President pro tempore.

Mr. COTTON thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

### RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

### MOTION TO INVOKE CLOTURE WITHDRAWN—MOTION TO PROCEED TO S. 625

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the cloture motion on the motion to proceed to S. 625 be withdrawn.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, the first vote of the week will occur at 5:30 p.m. this afternoon on confirmation of the nomination for Intellectual Property Enforcement Coordinator. There

are three other votes in the series tonight, and those nominations will be confirmed by voice vote.

Tomorrow the Senate will begin consideration of legislation to combat human trafficking. Members on both sides of the aisle have amendments to the bill, and those Senators should be working with Chairman GRASSLEY and Senator LEAHY to get in the queue for consideration. It is my expectation that votes in relation to the trafficking bill will kick in after the policy lunches tomorrow.

### HUMAN TRAFFICKING LEGISLATION

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, Senators from both sides of the aisle and from multiple committees have worked hard to address the terrible crime of human trafficking. This is a growing area of domestic and international activity. Victims are counting on us to act. That is why tomorrow the Senate will begin consideration of the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act. It is authored by the senior Senator from Texas and boasts sponsors from both parties. Victims groups and advocates have called this bipartisan measure the most comprehensive and thoughtful piece of antitrafficking legislation currently pending, and similar legislation has already passed the House of Representatives.

It is no wonder the Judiciary Committee supported, without opposition, the bipartisan bill we will begin considering tomorrow. After a reasonable period of debate and amendment, we hope

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S1323

to see strong bipartisan support here on the Senate floor as well.

#### RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Democratic leader is recognized.

#### HUMAN TRAFFICKING LEGISLATION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, on human trafficking, I underscore, appreciate, and agree with the statement of the Republican leader. I feel very confident we will clear on our side moving to that. I think it would be a waste of the Senate's time to have a vote on a motion to proceed and a waste of time afterward, so I hope we can get on this legislation tomorrow. I doubt there will be problems on my side. If there are, I will work to clear them.

#### NEGOTIATIONS WITH IRAN

Mr. REID. Mr. President, as I speak here today President Obama and his administration are engaged in negotiations to prevent Iran from building a nuclear weapon. These negotiations are unprecedented and very critical to our country and the world. The stakes couldn't be higher. We as leaders should do everything we can to help these negotiations succeed. When it comes to preventing Iran from obtaining a nuclear bomb, we should put partisanship way to one side.

Sadly, though, the judgment of my Republican colleagues seems to be clouded by their abhorrence of President Obama. Today Republican Senators actually sent a letter to the Iranian leadership aimed at sabotaging these negotiations.

Let's be very clear. Republicans are undermining our Commander in Chief while empowering the Ayatollahs. Just last week Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu was here in the Capitol decrying the evil intent of the Iranian leadership. Republicans at that speech, which took place down the hall from where we stand today, in the House Chamber, stood, applauded, stomped their feet, and yelled in support of what the Prime Minister of Israel had to say. Today those same Republicans are trying to negotiate with the very same leaders in Iran with whom Netanyahu said we shouldn't be negotiating. This simply doesn't make sense.

The outcome of the negotiations between the United States, France, the United Kingdom, Germany, China, Russia, and the entire world is so important. The main participants in these negotiations are the United States, France, the United Kingdom, Germany, China, and Russia. Even though we are one of the negotiators, the negotiations affect the entire world. This letter is a hard slap in the face of not only the United States but our allies. This

is not a time to undermine our Commander in Chief purely out of spite.

We should always have a robust debate about foreign policy, but it is unprecedented for one political party to directly intervene in an international negotiation with the sole goal of embarrassing the President of the United States.

Throughout the 8 years of President Bush's Presidency, Democrats—I disagreed with his foreign policy. I spoke about it on the floor lots of times. We know the disaster of the war in Iraq. But even at the height of our disagreements with President George W. Bush, Senate Democrats never considered sending a letter to Saddam Hussein or other Iraqi leaders at the time—never considered it, nor to be an embarrassment to the Commander in Chief, George W. Bush.

So I say to my Republican colleagues: Do you so dislike President Obama that you would take this extraordinary step? Obviously so.

Barack Obama is the President. This is an extraordinary step, and why it was taken, I really don't understand, other than a dislike of the President. Barack Obama is President. I have agreed with him on certain things, and I have disagreed with him on certain things, but he is my President, and he is a President to all of us. It is time for Republicans to accept that the citizens of our country twice elected President Obama by large margins as President of the United States.

Obviously Republicans don't know how to do anything other than attempt these seemingly juvenile political attacks against the President. Congressional Republicans don't know how to get things done. They don't know how to govern. If you don't believe what I just said, look at the press today; read a newspaper; look at the news. The pundits all agree that the Republicans are in a state of disarray here in the Congress of the United States. They don't know what to do or how to do it.

Today's unprecedented letter, originated by a U.S. Senator who took his oath of office 62 days ago, is a kind of pettiness that diminishes us as a country in the eyes of the world. The Republicans need to find a way to get over their animosity toward President Obama. I can only hope they do it sooner rather than later.

Mr. DURBIN. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. REID. I will be happy to yield to the assistant leader.

Mr. DURBIN. I thank the Senator for his remarks on this letter.

I can't think of a precedent where we have had one political party in the Senate try to intervene in international negotiations.

In this situation, if these negotiations fail, it is pretty clear to me that one of the options on the horizon will be military action against Iran. I pray to goodness that we never reach that point.

But I wish to ask the Senator from Nevada, those who are so anxious to

scuttle these negotiations, to undermine these negotiations, do you think they have reflected on the fact that the alternative could be another war in the Middle East?

Mr. REID. I say to my friend, with whom I have served in this Congress for 33 years, I have never seen anything like it. I have never seen anything like it.

I disagreed with President Bush so very much on what he was doing to our country, but I would never ever have considered anything even close to this.

The only thing I can figure out is what I said. The dislike of the President is so intense by the Republican leaders that this is what they are doing. They can't accept the fact that this good man, Barack Obama—this man with the unusual name—was elected twice by overwhelming margins by the people of this country, and he is doing his very best to try to alleviate a problem that exists.

It would be better for the world—I think everyone should acknowledge that—if we could work something out with Iran so they don't get nuclear weapons, and we have to try to do that. To prejudge what is going to come, if anything—the President of the United States said there is less than a 50-percent chance he can get it done, but shouldn't we let him try?

Mr. DURBIN. If the Senator will yield for another question, in the history of the Senate to date, back to the 1940s when Senator Vandenberg from Michigan joined in a bipartisan effort on foreign policy as one of the hallmark events in the history of this great body, and for decades when we served in the Senate, kind of the stock phrase was that politics ends at the water's edge when the President is representing the United States overseas. We can argue and use our constitutional powers to argue back and forth, but we want to give the President the authority to try to protect and defend this country.

Can the Senator from Nevada, who is a student of history, recall any other time when a group of Senators—a partisan group of Senators—reached out to a party in negotiations with the United States directly, as this letter has done?

Mr. REID. I say to my friend, I guess my thoughts have been clouded by the people I have worked with here. It was just a few years ago that two outstanding U.S. Senators who will go down in the history books—Dan Inouye and Ted Stevens. One was a good Republican, and one was a good Democrat. They worked arm in arm on issues that made our country a better country. They would never ever consider such a thing. If they were here today, they would be on this floor demanding: What is going on here? One of these two men was a ranking member of the defense appropriations committee that funds the military. These two men worked together on that subcommittee for more than a decade, and they worked together.

My judgment is clouded by the people I have worked with here who would never consider anything like this.

Mr. DURBIN. I will ask the Senator from Nevada a further question. Didn't we also have a similar precedent when Senator McCAIN and Senator Kerry were leaders in an effort to finally establish diplomatic recognition of Vietnam and normalize relations? This was a bipartisan effort to try to move us beyond a painful chapter in our history which cost so many American lives. That, too, was bipartisan, as I recall.

Mr. REID. And if anyone should have some ill feelings about Vietnam, JOHN McCAIN, who came to the House of Representatives with the Senator and me, was in a prison camp for 5 years and 4 of those years were in solitary confinement. John Kerry was shot, was wounded—highly decorated, but he had a little beef with the Vietnamese. And they worked together because they thought it would be good for our country to reestablish relations with that country.

So my mind is—I repeat—clouded with the experience I have in this body with leaders such as Mark Hatfield, a Republican, who would never ever consider anything like this.

I am dumbfounded that 47 of my colleagues would sign a letter. Last week they were over here, as I said, jumping up and down and cheering the Prime Minister of Israel because he was denigrating what was going on in Iran—you can't negotiate with these people—and now they are sending a letter to the same people whom they were cheering against just a week ago?

Would the Chair announce the business of the day.

#### RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 5 p.m., with the time equally divided in the usual form, and with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The assistant Democratic leader.

#### FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF BLOODY SUNDAY

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, last Saturday marked the 50th anniversary of what has come to be known as Bloody Sunday. In March of 1965, Congressman JOHN LEWIS, then a young man fresh out of college, and Rev. Hosea Williams led 600 brave civil rights activists across the Edmund Pettus Bridge in Selma, AL.

These courageous men and women, and children marching with them, were marching in pursuit of the most funda-

mental right—the right preservative of all others—the right to vote. What they received that day, however, were brutal beatings from police batons as State troopers turned them back and chased them down.

A few days later, President Lyndon B. Johnson addressed the Nation and called on Congress to pass the Voting Rights Act. Within months, the legislation was signed into law—guaranteeing that the fundamental right to vote would not be restricted through clever State and local schemes, such as poll taxes and literacy tests.

I was proud to join Congressman LEWIS on a trip to Selma about 10 years ago for a ceremonial walk across the bridge to mark the 40th anniversary of Bloody Sunday. As we marched on a Sunday morning in the footsteps of the civil rights giants, we celebrated a bill that has often been called the most significant civil rights law ever passed by Congress. Little did we know that 8 years later, in 2013, the Supreme Court would strike down a major provision of that law.

In *Shelby County v. Holder*, by a 5-to-4 vote, a divided Supreme Court struck down the provision of the Voting Rights Act that required certain jurisdictions to preclear changes to their voting laws with the Department of Justice. The decision effectively gutted the Voting Rights Act.

In the aftermath of the *Shelby County* decision, several State legislatures pushed through discriminatory and onerous restrictions on voting that previously would have required Department of Justice clearance.

We have heard disturbing stories of a 93-year-old veteran and a nearly 70-year-old doctor who were turned away from the polls in Texas because their IDs did not meet the specifications of an onerous new State law. We heard about Florida's faulty voter verification efforts that disproportionately flag Hispanic citizens for removal from the voter rolls. And we have heard how the elimination of out-of-precinct voting and cuts to early voting impacted minority voters in North Carolina.

It is hard to believe that 50 years after Selma, we are watching State legislatures pass legislation restricting opportunities to vote in America. None of us want to subscribe or endorse voter fraud—not a person on either side of the aisle—but this goes far beyond it.

As chairman of the Judiciary subcommittee on the Constitution, I held hearings in Florida and Ohio, where they were enacting restrictive laws to limit opportunities to vote—limiting the time you can vote, requiring IDs.

In each of those States, I called as my first witnesses elected officials of both political parties. I asked, in both States, the same question to the first panel of witnesses: What has happened in your State by way of voter fraud that has led you to restrict the opportunity to vote in your States of Ohio and Florida? The answer was: Nothing—nothing.

Then we discussed how many people have actually been prosecuted for voter fraud that led to this tightening of the laws and limiting the opportunity to vote. In Ohio, the answer was: We think in the last 10 years, a few people might have been prosecuted. This clearly was not a problem in need of a solution. This was clearly an effort made in these State legislatures to restrict the opportunity to vote for certain Americans. Why? If you believe in this country, if you believe in democracy, if you believe in the right to vote, why do so many State legislatures—under the guidance of a group called ALEC—why are they changing their laws to restrict the right to vote? Clearly it is because they want certain people to find it more difficult to vote.

When I chaired this subcommittee and I had this series of hearings, we heard over and over again that these laws have a disproportionate negative impact on lower income individuals, minorities, youth, elderly, and other vulnerable populations.

I wish that 50 years after Bloody Sunday, our society had reached a point where the protections of the Voting Rights Act were no longer necessary. But we have seen in State after State that we still need the protections of the law, or people—good American citizens—will be denied their opportunity to cast a vote in an election.

So in order to truly honor the foot soldiers of Bloody Sunday, we have to do more than vote for congressional medals. We have to work together to pass the Voting Rights Amendment Act to ensure the Federal Government is once again able to fully protect the fundamental right to vote for all American citizens.

The Voting Rights Amendment Act, which Senator LEAHY, Senator COONS, and I plan to reintroduce soon, will undo the damage of the *Shelby County* decision. Our bill will restore the Voting Rights Act by updating the formula that determines which jurisdictions must preclear changes to their voting practices with the Justice Department.

In 2006, Congress reauthorized the Voting Rights Act with an overwhelming bipartisan vote. The spirit of Bloody Sunday—the spirit of Selma, AL—was alive and well 9 years ago, when both political parties stood up and said: We are both going to endorse it. It is the right thing to do.

Mr. President, 390 Members in the House out of 435 voted for it, and 98 Senators—from both political parties—voted to reauthorize it, 9 years ago. Congress, after all the hearings—21 of them—with more than 90 witnesses testifying, produced a record that exceeded 15,000 pages, and the bill was solid in the law.

We recognized then that despite the progress we have made in the years since that famous march, there still was unlawful and unfair discrimination against Americans who wanted to exercise their right to vote.

The Supreme Court ignored our work, and in the Shelby County decision overturned a key section of this law. That is why we need to once again step up on a bipartisan basis to pass this Voting Rights Amendment Act.

#### LYNCH NOMINATION

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I might also reflect on that victory 50 years ago and think about another civil rights milestone that we have an opportunity to act on this week—this week—in Washington.

Two weeks ago, the Judiciary Committee favorably reported the nomination of Loretta Lynch to the full Senate. If confirmed by the Senate, Ms. Lynch will become the first African-American woman to serve as Attorney General of the United States.

In January, she gave moving testimony to the committee about sitting on her father's shoulders as a young girl so she could witness civil rights activists planning sit-ins and marches in the early 1960s.

Ms. Lynch is incredible. She is so well qualified that in the course of 2 days of hearings, there was virtually no negative question asked of her. She handled it so well.

She has now waited 121 days for confirmation by the Senate. Loretta Lynch has waited longer than any nominee for Attorney General in the last 30 years. She languishes on the calendar. It is embarrassing to think that after all of the speeches and all of the reflection of this last weekend on the progress we have made in civil rights in America, this woman, whose nomination in and of itself is a civil rights victory, is being held up in the Senate for no obvious reason.

As Congressman LEWIS said in a recent letter to the Judiciary Committee, Ms. Lynch "recognizes the value of all people and has fought vigorously to ensure their equal protection under the law." JOHN LEWIS said: "She will carry the torch of justice to help make the United States a more perfect union."

Mr. President, we are not a perfect union. We will strive throughout our history to reach that almost impossible goal. There is a lot of work we need to do, and each generation must accept it. First we need to confirm Loretta Lynch, and let's do it soon. Let's do it this week so she can lead the Department of Justice and continue the fight to move our Nation forward. And we must restore the Voting Rights Act so the Justice Department has the tools it needs to ensure the efforts of those who marched 50 years ago.

As I said before, no other Attorney General nominee in the last three decades has had to wait this long to receive a confirmation vote on the floor of the Senate. By way of comparison, the Democratic-controlled Senate confirmed Michael Mukasey as Attorney General 53 days after his nomination was announced.

Ms. Lynch was reported out of the Judiciary Committee on February 26 in a bipartisan vote. On that day, the Judiciary Committee also reported out the nomination of Michelle Lee to be Director of the Patent and Trademark Office as well as a bill called the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act.

The majority leader has scheduled a vote on Ms. Lee for today, and he has said the Senate will vote this week on the trafficking legislation. Why is Ms. Lynch's nomination being kept in limbo while these other matters are being scheduled ahead of her? There is no reason to stall the process for Ms. Lynch any further. The majority leader should schedule a confirmation vote without delay.

When we have that confirmation vote, I will be proud to vote in support of Loretta Lynch. She is a nominee of outstanding qualifications, integrity, and judgment. She has been confirmed twice before by the Senate to serve as the U.S. Attorney for the Eastern District of New York, and she has served in that position with distinction. She has prosecuted some of the highest profile cases in the country, and she has received widespread praise for her diligence and her no-nonsense approach.

Ms. Lynch is a prosecutor's prosecutor. But her resume stands out for other reasons as well. She received undergraduate and law degrees from Harvard. She has private sector experience at prestigious law firms, including working as a defense attorney and on civil matters. And she has international experience working for the U.N. International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda.

Through it all, Ms. Lynch has never forgotten her roots, growing up as the daughter of a minister and a school librarian in North Carolina. Loretta Lynch's life is a testament to the fact that in America, glass ceilings can be shattered through hard work, perseverance, and outstanding performance on the job. Now the Senate is in the position to confirm this historic nominee to serve as our next Attorney General—once her floor vote gets scheduled.

I think Ms. Lynch will do an excellent job. But don't take it from me. Let me read some of the praise for Ms. Lynch that has come from individuals and groups that have endorsed her.

Here is what the president of the National District Attorneys Association, Michael Moore, said about her:

On behalf of the National District Attorneys Association, representing 2500 elected and appointed District Attorneys across the United States as well as 40,000 assistant district attorneys, I write in strong support of Loretta Lynch's nomination to lead the Department of Justice as the next Attorney General of the United States. As prosecutors facing challenges in the field from violent crime, to human trafficking, to gangs and drug traffickers, our membership feels that Ms. Lynch understands the operational nature of these challenges and will be a strong independent voice at the helm of the Department.

Here is a letter signed by 25 former U.S. attorneys, both Republicans and Democrats, including Patrick Fitzgerald and Scott Lassar from my home State of Illinois. They said:

We are all former United States Attorneys. Some of us served in Republican administrations, some in Democratic administrations. We all share a deep commitment to the rule of law and an abiding respect for the Department of Justice. . . . We firmly believe that Ms. Lynch will make an outstanding Attorney General. . . . we believe that Ms. Lynch has the experience, temperament, independence, integrity, and judgment to immediately assume this critically important position.

Law enforcement groups support Ms. Lynch, too. Here's a letter from the President of the International Association of Chiefs of Police, Richard Beary. He said:

The IACP believes that Ms. Lynch's years of service have clearly demonstrated that she has the qualifications and experience necessary to be an effective leader of the U.S. Department of Justice . . . The IACP urges you to confirm Ms. Lynch's nomination rapidly.

Here is a letter from the president of the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association, representing 26,000 active and retired federal law enforcement officers. He expressed his full support for Ms. Lynch and said:

FLEOA stands behind her proven leadership and her support for those who investigate and enforce the federal statutes. . . . Her accomplishments and her leadership continue to resonate in the law enforcement community, and she possesses the requisite institutional knowledge that is required of the position of Attorney General.

These are just some of the endorsements that Ms. Lynch has received. She has also been endorsed by other prosecutor and law enforcement groups, bar associations, business leaders, civil rights organizations, and former top Justice Department officials from both parties.

As I mentioned earlier, this past weekend marked the 50th Anniversary of Bloody Sunday when 600 civil rights marchers were beaten on the Edmund Pettus Bridge in Selma, AL. Our Nation's conscience was shocked by the image of JOHN LEWIS, now a Congressman from the State of Georgia, being beaten and badly injured on Bloody Sunday by troopers with nightsticks.

JOHN LEWIS has spent his life marching for the cause of justice. He speaks with a voice of moral authority that all of us should heed. Several weeks ago Congressman LEWIS sent a letter to the Judiciary Committee in support of Ms. Lynch.

I want to read an extended excerpt from the letter I mentioned earlier. Congressman LEWIS said:

With over 30 years of legal experience, Ms. Lynch is unwavering in her efforts to create a more just society. A Harvard graduate with an extensive career in public service, private practice, and academia, she recognizes the value of all people and has fought vigorously to ensure their equal protection under the law.

She will carry the torch of justice to help make the United States a more perfect

union. Ms. Lynch's commitment to civil rights stems from her family's roots in North Carolina. Her father, a Baptist minister, preached at a church where students would meet to organize anti-segregation boycotts. Her grandfather, a sharecropper and pastor in the 1930s, helped people in his community who faced challenges under the Jim Crow system.

I will never forget Loretta Lynch's description of her father raising her onto his shoulders so she could witness the civil rights protestors in his church. The fact that this young girl could be the first African-American woman to serve as our Nation's Attorney General is another milestone on our Nation's long, slow march to establish a "more perfect union."

The bottom line is this: Loretta Lynch is extraordinarily well-qualified to serve as Attorney General. She has been extensively vetted, and she has performed admirably while in the spotlight of that process. And Members of the Senate have had plenty of time to review her qualifications.

It is time to move forward and hold a vote on Ms. Lynch. There is nothing to be gained by further delay. I hope the majority leader, Senator McCONNELL, will call her nomination for a vote and I hope all my colleagues will support this outstanding nominee.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

#### HUMAN TRAFFICKING

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. ERNST). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, we spend a lot of time, as one would expect in a legislative body, talking about the technical aspects of legislation and the procedure we use to consider it and pass it, a subject which perhaps many of us enjoy but which probably turns the public—puts a glaze in their eyes and bores them because they don't see the relevance of it.

We talk about motions to proceed and cloture and filibusters, but what is important in the Senate is the subject matter of the legislation that we apply this procedure or these rules to. This week in the Senate we will be undertaking a very important subject; that is, how to protect our fellow citizens, many of them children, who are needing our help and waiting to be rescued. Those are children who are being trafficked in the commercial sex and forced-labor trade—not over there, not necessarily just in some other country, but right here in the United States of America.

I believe that we are all created in the image of God, that all human beings are entitled to be treated with dignity and respect. But the criminals

who traffic in human flesh treat these same human beings created in the image of God as a thing. They treat these children as a commodity to be bought and sold. To me that is the very definition of evil. A few weeks ago the Judiciary Committee heard from several witnesses on what has been called modern day slavery—human trafficking.

I know many of us thought that slavery was an ugly part of our Nation's beginning but certainly only something in the past. But the truth is that there exists today something that you could legitimately call modern day slavery, and that is human trafficking. Now, even though institutionalized slavery has long been cast into the dustbin of history and is something we read about in our history books, human trafficking, particularly sex trafficking, still affects the lives of hundreds and thousands of our children.

Tragically, many of them are young girls. As the father of two daughters, it turns my stomach to realize that a majority of the human beings who are trafficked are girls who are of middle-school age. In the Judiciary Committee, we heard from Malika Saada Saar who represents a wonderful organization called Rights4Girls.

Malika spoke of a young woman named Aviva. According to Malika, Aviva was in foster care when a trafficker kidnapped her and held her hostage for almost a year. During this time, we learned in the Judiciary Committee during that hearing, Aviva was sold to as many as 10 different men a night. Of course, she did not understand. She could not comprehend why an adult man would want to buy her body when she was just a child.

When law enforcement officials found Aviva, she was arrested for prostitution at the age of 15. Let me repeat that because it is important. This young girl who was kidnapped, raped, and sold nightly—daily—was treated like a criminal, not a victim. In 1992 Holly Austin Smith ran away from home and was forced into a sex trafficking ring the summer before her freshman year of high school.

Within hours of running away, 14-year old Holly was sold for \$200 to a man who wanted her for sex because he said she reminded him of his granddaughter. When police eventually found Holly—still only a child, scared and confused, as you can only imagine—they treated her as a criminal, not as a victim. Too often these children, who are not of the age of consent, are treated as child prostitutes.

As many of us who have worked on this issue for some time know, there is no such thing as a child prostitute. If you are not of the age of consent, you cannot consent, and you cannot agree to be used in such a horrific way. These are children who are bought and sold for sex—plain and simple—as nauseating as that truth is. Malika powerfully said during our hearing: "There should be no difference between raping

a child and paying to rape a child." Now, the individuals who commit these crimes—not just the people who traffic in them but the people who purchase these services—too often pay a fine and get on with their lives. Yet they are the child rapists who should be treated as the sex traffickers they are.

If it were not for the demand, sex trafficking would not have a business model. But unfortunately, there is too great of a demand. But often the people who purchase these children are treated with impunity. Tomorrow, I expect the Senate will move to consider legislation that I have introduced with a number of our colleagues from Minnesota, Illinois, and Oregon. Indeed, there are a number of Senators who have already contributed a lot of very good and constructive work to the product we will turn to tomorrow.

The bill is called the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act. The most important thing that it does is that it ends the culture of impunity for the people who purchase children and other victims of human trafficking. It holds the so-called johns and the pimps accountable, and it does not focus on the victim who should be treated like a victim and helped to heal and get on with their lives. But too often they are the ones who are prosecuted and treated as a criminal.

Instead of being treated as criminals, this bill makes sure that the future Avivas and Hollys are treated for what they are, and that is as victims. What this bill also does is it takes the money and assets forfeited from convicted human traffickers and directs it to services for the victims. So future Avivas and Hollys would have a shelter, a place to live, a roof over their head, a bed to sleep in, and somebody who loves them and cares enough to help them heal and get on with their lives. That is the kind of treatment these victims of human trafficking deserve—not jail time.

We know that Washington can be a dysfunctional place more times than we would like to admit. So often there are political issues or ideological issues that divide us. But the fight against human trafficking reminds us that it does not have to be this way. Indeed, I was heartened a few weeks ago when this particular piece of legislation passed the Judiciary Committee with unanimous support. All Republicans and all Democrats on the committee voted to support it.

Indeed, Republicans and Democrats—not just in Congress but across the country—support this legislation, as evidenced by the more than 200 different organizations, from victims' advocates to law enforcement groups, which have joined forces to fight this modern day slave trade and to support the legislation we will turn to tomorrow. It is a fight, sadly, that must be acknowledged and it must be fought. But it is a fight we can win, finally delivering our Nation's promise of freedom to those who are enslaved.

It is not the kind of slavery we read about in our history books or the kind that resulted or helped precipitate the Civil War, but it is the kind that goes on unbeknownst to most Americans and most people but which represents that seamy underbelly of society, one that we must expose and one we must reveal as the evil that it is.

#### OFFICE OF COMPLIANCE ADMINISTRATIVE AND TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS ACT OF 2015

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 1213, which was received from the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1213) to make administrative and technical corrections to the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and any statements relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (H.R. 1213) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, what is the parliamentary situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is in morning business until 5 p.m.

Mr. LEAHY. I thank the Chair.

#### FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF BLOODY SUNDAY

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, this past weekend, Americans gathered in Selma, Alabama. They did that to mark the 50th anniversary of Bloody Sunday. Many of us are old enough to remember that day when hundreds of brave men and women marched across the Edmund Pettus Bridge. There, they were savagely beaten because they dared to stand up for their right to vote—a right that we in Vermont take as inalienable. Their blood, their sweat, and their tears helped pave the way for the Voting Rights Act. They ultimately helped move our Nation toward what is supposed to be a “more perfect Union.”

In commemorating the bravery of these foot soldiers for justice, we are

reminded of what we can accomplish if we stand on principle and we come together, Republicans and Democrats, to do what is right. At a time when lawmakers seem far too polarized on the most important issues facing our Nation, I was encouraged to see leaders from both political parties join President Obama and Congressman LEWIS, and so many others this weekend in Selma. President George W. Bush shared the stage with President Obama to honor the brave men and women who inspired the Nation and helped bring about historic change.

I was proud to work with President Bush on the reauthorization of the Voting Rights Act, along with the Republican Chairmen of the House and Senate Judiciary Committees, Congressman SENSENBRENNER and Senator Specter. We can see them on each side of President Bush in this picture of the bill signing. We can see Congressman SENSENBRENNER standing there and the late Senator Specter standing there. I was standing over here with my camera as one of the people who helped move the bill through. President Bush had invited me to attend and I took this photograph at the signing ceremony. I am going to give this photograph to President Bush because it is the only photograph where we can actually see his hand and his signature going down. That is because I was the only person with a camera, standing behind the President. I don't say that to praise my photographic ability; I say that to praise President Bush for signing the bill.

In response to the Supreme Court's Shelby County decision—a decision where five members of the Supreme Court decided they had a far better idea than virtually all House Members and Senators—I have been working with Congressman SENSENBRENNER on bipartisan legislation that would restore the Voting Rights Act. This is so that President Obama can sign a bill as President Bush did. Unfortunately, no Republican Senator has yet stepped forward to join me in introducing this legislation in the Senate.

The Republican Party of 2006, along with their President, reached across the aisle to advance the cause of voting rights, saying they were not there for any particular party, they were there for all Americans. I am still hopeful the Republican Senate of 2015 will continue the bipartisan tradition that President Bush and Republican leaders did in 2006.

The civil rights milestones we celebrate this month can't be just historical discussions to be talked about in a history class somewhere. The plain reality is that racial discrimination in voting still exists in this country. Chief Justice Roberts acknowledged that very fact in his opinion in Shelby, and he asked Congress to update the Voting Rights Act. I wish we had not had the Shelby decision—I think it was wrong on many counts—but the majority in the Supreme Court voted that

way. I agree with the Chief Justice that it is time for us in the Congress—Republicans and Democrats alike—to act.

In his inspirational speech in Selma on Saturday, President Obama noted that 100 Members of Congress had come to Selma to honor people who died for the right to vote. He then laid out a challenge by saying, “If we want to honor this day, let that hundred go back to Washington and gather 400 more, and together, pledge to make it their mission to restore the Voting Rights Act this year. That's how we honor those people on this bridge.”

I agree with him. We should come together, as this body has done so many times before, to restore the Voting Rights Act and to reaffirm our steadfast commitment to equal protection under the law.

#### LYNCH NOMINATION

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, today, in that same spirit, I urge all Senators to come together to confirm Loretta Lynch to be our next Attorney General and the first African-American woman ever to hold this position. The delay of her confirmation is unprecedented and unwarranted. It should end.

It has been 121 days since President Obama announced his intention to nominate Ms. Lynch. Her nomination was reported by the Judiciary Committee on a bipartisan basis 11 days ago. In the last 30 years, no Attorney General nominee has waited longer than Loretta Lynch to receive a floor vote after being reported from committee.

I think of what we did when President Bush was in the last 2 years of his Presidency. Democrats had just taken back the majority in the Senate. He nominated a person for Attorney General—actually a person I voted against—but I moved that person forward anyway because I felt the President of the United States deserved to have an Attorney General. I moved that person through in half the time we have had to wait for Loretta Lynch.

Ms. Lynch has broad support from Democrats and Republicans across the legal and law enforcement communities. So there is no excuse. She shouldn't be treated differently than previous nominees. Actually, she should receive a vote tonight, along with the other nominees who are to be confirmed. She should not be treated any differently than President Bush's nominee.

So in the wake of the bipartisan and inspirational celebration in Selma, let us come together to honor the difficult work of the Justice Department. Let's schedule a vote to confirm the first African-American woman to serve as Attorney General of the United States. Let us show the American people what we can do when we come together. Let us finally vote to confirm Loretta Lynch.

I see the majority leader on the floor. I don't want to take his time.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT  
AGREEMENT—S. 178

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that following morning business on Tuesday, March 10, the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. 178, a bill to provide justice for the victims of trafficking.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASIDY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

LYNCH NOMINATION

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, a few minutes ago I was talking about why I had hoped that after 121 days we could finally have a vote on the confirmation of Loretta Lynch to be Attorney General. She has been supported by leading Republicans and Democrats. She has been supported by Republicans and Democrats in law enforcement, especially in light of her very tough enforcement of terrorism laws. On the issue of abuse of public trust, she has prosecuted both Democrats and Republicans.

I mentioned a few minutes ago that when George W. Bush was in the last two years of his term, he was a lame-duck President and Democrats had just taken over control of the Senate. The President nominated Judge Mukasey to be Attorney General. Because I disagreed with Judge Mukasey on the question of torture, I told the President I would vote against him, but I also told him that any President has a right to at least have a vote on their nominees. I moved him forward in 53 days—that is from the time his nomination was announced until he was confirmed. And that includes the time it took for the paperwork to get up here and the rest of the process. I put him through the committee, got him onto the floor, and he was confirmed in 53 days.

Now we have been waiting 121 days for Loretta Lynch, who came to the Judiciary Committee with far more law enforcement background. I don't know what the difference is between this man, Judge Mukasey, who took 53 days and Loretta Lynch.

In fact, I will give you another Attorney General nominee I also disagreed with and voted against, but who I, as chairman, helped bring to a vote. President Bush nominated John

Ashcroft—a former Senator who had just been defeated—to be Attorney General. I put him through in 42 days—42 days from the time his nomination was announced until he was confirmed. Forty-two days.

So Ashcroft went through in 42 days. Judge Mukasey went through in 53 days. Loretta Lynch has waited 121 days.

I was involved with the nominations of these two men even though I disagreed with them. When Republicans took back control of the Senate there was another Attorney General in between who took 86 days. But for the two men when I was Chairman: 42 days for John Ashcroft; 53 days for Judge Mukasey. But Loretta Lynch has been waiting 121 days and still hasn't had a vote. Is it any wonder that people have concern about the U.S. Senate when she has to wait all that time just to get a vote up or down? Up or down, that is all we ask. So let's hope she can be scheduled, voted on and confirmed because with her record as a tough prosecutor, that is the sort of person I would like cracking down on terrorists, cracking down on those who defraud this country, cracking down on traffickers, as she has in the past.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEAHY. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING  
BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF DANIEL HENRY MARTI TO BE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ENFORCEMENT COORDINATOR, EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

NOMINATION OF MICHELLE K. LEE TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF COMMERCE FOR INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY AND DIRECTOR OF THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

NOMINATION OF JEFFERY S. HALL TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION BOARD, FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

NOMINATION OF DALLAS P. TONSAGER TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION BOARD, FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nominations of Daniel Henry Marti, of Virginia, to be Intellectual Property Enforcement Coordinator, Executive Office of the President; Michelle K. Lee, of California, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual Property and Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office; Jeffery S. Hall, of Kentucky, to be a Member of the Farm Credit Administration Board, Farm Credit Administration, for a term expiring October 13, 2018; and Dallas P. Tonsager, of South Dakota, to be a Member of the Farm Credit Administration Board, Farm Credit Administration, for a term expiring May 21, 2020.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. I ask unanimous consent that the time until 5:30 p.m. be equally divided in the usual form, with all other provisions of the previous order remaining in effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I understand, for the information of Senators, that means the vote will still be at 5:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum and ask unanimous consent that the time be equally divided.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.



The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### LEE AND MARTI NOMINATIONS

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I welcome the Senate's action today to confirm two well-regarded practitioners to important leadership positions charged with protecting and promoting intellectual property.

Michelle Lee, who is nominated to serve as the Director of the Patent and Trademark Office, USPTO, will be the first woman and first Asian Pacific American to hold this position. She is also the daughter of immigrants who moved to this country and contributed to the growth of Silicon Valley through her father's career as an electrical engineer. Her historic nomination is an American success story, and it is fitting that she is confirmed today to lead the office that is home to countless stories of successful innovation and creation by Americans throughout the country.

The USPTO has been without a Senate-confirmed director for more than 2 years, which is far too long for an office that is so important to our Nation's innovators and to our economy. Close to 600,000 patent applications and 450,000 trademark class applications are filed with the office each year. By serving America's innovators, the USPTO helps Vermonters and citizens across the country build their businesses and bring their inventions to the global marketplace.

Ms. Lee is charged with leading this office at a time when too many bad actors are abusing the patent system. Something must be done to address misconduct by bad actors who are targeting everyone from small businesses in Vermont to larger companies that are crucial to our economy. Congress plays an important role in this discussion, and as I have said for the last 2 years, we must enact balanced reforms to ensure the patent system can thrive. While that discussion continues in Congress, the USPTO Director must ensure the policies we currently have in place work for the diverse patent community.

Among those policies is carrying out the landmark reforms in the Leahy-Smith America Invents Act, the greatest transformation to our patent system in over 60 years. This landmark law has helped simplify the process for patent approval, reduce backlogs at the USPTO, and harmonize our patent system with the rest of the world. The AIA sought to improve patent quality by creating new and more efficient administrative proceedings at the USPTO. Three years later, the USPTO has now received over 2,000 petitions for post-grant review. These measures are important to help businesses that fall into the crosshairs of overbroad patents. But improving the quality of patents also improves their value for inventors and investors, too. The USPTO is doing tremendous work to implement these new programs under Ms. Lee's current leadership as Deputy

Director of the office. Because of the AIA, there are now four satellite offices around the country to make the USPTO more accessible to inventors and small businesses. The USPTO has strengthened its pro bono program and used its fee-setting authority created by the AIA to gain better financial independence.

These are profound improvements, but strong leadership at the USPTO is needed to ensure the America Invents Act helps our patent system to thrive in the 21st century. As the USPTO's Deputy Director, Ms. Lee has proven to be thoughtful, balanced, and respectful of the diverse perspectives across the patent community. I look forward to continuing the Judiciary Committee's productive relationship with Ms. Lee and with the USPTO.

I also welcome the Senate's action today to confirm Daniel Marti as the second Intellectual Property Enforcement Coordinator, or "IPEC." The IPEC was created by legislation I authored in 2008, the PRO-IP Act, which passed the Senate with unanimous support. In creating this position, our goal was to take a comprehensive approach to intellectual property enforcement within the U.S. government, to ensure that law enforcement has the tools it needs, and that agencies are working together efficiently. The first IPEC, Victoria Espinel, built a strong record in this position, and I am confident Mr. Marti will do well continuing this important work.

The protection of intellectual property is important to our Nation's creators, artists, inventors, and businesses alike. Whether one is a filmmaker whose work is being copied and distributed online without permission, or a family-owned business in Vermont that discovers knock-off copies of its products being sold at half the price, intellectual property theft harms innovators across the country. It also harms consumers, as we have learned from the repeated, devastating stories of victims who inadvertently purchased counterfeit medicines or other products not knowing they were of dangerously low quality.

The IPEC plays an important role coordinating law enforcement and industry efforts to address these pressing issues. Nowhere is this work more important than in addressing counterfeiting and infringement in the online world—a complex, global problem that requires creative, thoughtful solutions. Just last month, leading advertising networks announced a new initiative to help ensure that they avoid inadvertently supporting websites that serve no legitimate purpose other than to traffic in stolen content and property. Search engines have now acknowledged that they, too, have a responsibility to help address illegal activity online. I hope Mr. Marti will renew the IPEC's work to support and encourage these voluntary initiatives, and will continue these efforts with other actors who drive so much of the

online economy. Every business that operates in the Internet ecosystem has a role to play.

Mr. Marti is currently the managing partner of the Washington, DC office of Kilpatrick, Townsend & Stockton LLP. A graduate of Georgetown University and Emory University School of Law, he has spent his entire legal career specializing in intellectual property law, with a focus in trademark law and the protection of intellectual property both domestically and internationally.

I look forward to continuing the Judiciary Committee's productive relationship with Mr. Marti and the IPEC office. Last year, Senator GRASSLEY and I sent a letter to President Obama urging him to nominate a candidate to fill the IPEC position, which has been vacant for over 18 months. I chaired a confirmation hearing for Mr. Marti in December in the hope that the Senate would move swiftly with his confirmation this year. With Mr. Marti's confirmation today, the IPEC office can return fully to its important work.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, today the Senate will vote on two nominees charged with important responsibilities in the enforcement of our Nation's intellectual property laws.

The first is Daniel Marti, who is nominated to become Intellectual Property Enforcement Coordinator in the Executive Office of the President.

The second is Michelle Lee, who is nominated to become the next Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual Property and Director of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office.

The United States is a world leader in the innovation of cutting-edge technologies and products that improve our daily lives. Importantly, the United States' economy, indeed every industry, relies heavily on intellectual property.

Because intellectual property rights are critical to the Nation's economic well-being, we need strong and capable leaders at the helm of the offices that deal with patents, trademarks and copyrights. And because the top positions at the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office and the Office of the Intellectual Property Enforcement Coordinator have been vacant for quite some time, I am pleased that we are able to fill them today with two highly qualified candidates.

Mr. Marti and Ms. Lee have proven track records in the field of intellectual property law and are well respected by the intellectual property community.

Their experience and expertise are of the caliber required for their respective positions. I believe they are excellent candidates for these positions, and I will support their nominations.

#### VOTE ON MARTI NOMINATION

The question now occurs on the Marti nomination.

Mr. VITTER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?



There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Daniel Henry Marti, of Virginia, to be Intellectual Property Enforcement Coordinator, Executive Office of the President?

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Indiana (Mr. COATS), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI), the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO), and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LANKFORD). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 92, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 69 Ex.]

#### YEAS—92

Alexander	Fischer	Murray
Ayotte	Flake	Nelson
Baldwin	Franken	Paul
Barrasso	Gardner	Perdue
Bennet	Gillibrand	Peters
Blumenthal	Grassley	Portman
Blunt	Hatch	Reed
Booker	Heitkamp	Reid
Boozman	Heller	Risch
Boxer	Hirono	Roberts
Brown	Hoeven	Rounds
Burr	Inhofe	Sanders
Cantwell	Isakson	Sasse
Capito	Johnson	Schatz
Cardin	Kaine	Schumer
Carper	King	Scott
Casey	Kirk	Sessions
Cassidy	Klobuchar	Shelby
Cochran	Lankford	Stabenow
Collins	Leahy	Sullivan
Coons	Lee	Tester
Corker	Manchin	Thune
Cornyn	Markey	Tillis
Cotton	McCain	Udall
Crapo	McCaskill	Vitter
Daines	McConnell	Warner
Donnelly	Menendez	Warren
Durbin	Merkley	Whitehouse
Enzi	Mikulski	Wicker
Ernst	Moran	Wyden
Feinstein	Murphy	

#### NOT VOTING—8

Coats	Heinrich	Shaheen
Cruz	Murkowski	Toomey
Graham	Rubio	

The nomination was confirmed.

#### VOTE ON LEE NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Michelle K. Lee, of California, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual Property and Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office?

The nomination was confirmed.

#### VOTE ON HALL NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Jeffery S. Hall, of Kentucky, to be a Member of the Farm Credit Administration Board, Farm Credit Administration, for a term expiring October 13, 2018?

The nomination was confirmed.

#### VOTE ON TONSAGER NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Dallas P. Tonsager, of South Dakota, to be a Member of the Farm Credit Administration Board, Farm Credit Administration, for a term expiring May 21, 2020?

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motions to reconsider are considered made and laid upon the table and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's actions.

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume legislation session.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

#### FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SELMA MARCHES

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I rise today on the 50th anniversary of the Selma marches and to call on Congress to come together to protect all Americans' sacred right to vote.

In March of 1965, thousands of Americans came together in Alabama to march the 54-mile highway from Selma to the State capital of Montgomery. They marched in defiance of the segregationist repression in the Jim Crow South. They marched to demand that Black American citizens be allowed to exercise their constitutional right to vote.

On March 7, 1965, 50 years ago this week, some 600 civil rights marchers headed east of Selma on U.S. Route 80. That day, March 7, would go down in history as Bloody Sunday. They got as far as the Edmund Pettus Bridge, 6 blocks away, where State and local law enforcement attacked them with billy clubs and tear gas and drove them back into Selma.

This photo reflects the scene on the bridge where JOHN LEWIS and others were being struck down with batons. Images of peaceful marchers brutally attacked by uniformed State troopers were broadcast worldwide. Seeing how

peaceful activists who sought to ensure the franchise were treated by the very law enforcement officers sworn to uphold the law in Selma shocked the conscience of Americans everywhere and began an awakening that would ultimately lead to the passage of the 1965 Voting Rights Act.

Two days later, on March 9, Martin Luther King, Jr., led a symbolic march to the same bridge where they were confronted by State troopers. Still awaiting requested Federal protection, and seeking to minimize the risk of additional violence, Dr. King turned the marchers around and led them back to the church where they had started.

Dr. King knew the threat of Jim Crow had to be stopped by the law, so he sought Federal court protection for a third full-scale march from Selma to the State capital in Montgomery. Ruling in favor of the demonstrators, Federal District Court Judge Frank M. Johnson, Jr., wrote:

The law is clear that the right to petition one's government for the redress of grievances may be exercised in large groups . . . and these rights may be exercised by marching, even along public highways.

On Sunday, March 21, 2 weeks after Bloody Sunday, approximately 3,200 marchers set out for Montgomery, walking 12 miles a day and sleeping in fields. By the time they reached the capital on Thursday, March 25, they were 25,000 strong.

As Dr. King said standing in front of the capital that day:

Selma, Alabama became a shining moment in the conscience of man. If the worst in American life lurked in its dark streets, the best of American instincts arose passionately from across the nation to overcome it.

Less than 5 months after the last of the three marches, President Lyndon Johnson signed the Voting Rights Act of 1965—landmark legislation that fundamentally transformed voting rights in the United States, particularly in the Jim Crow South.

As Americans, we all owe a debt of gratitude to those who marched, those who bled, and in some cases those who died, to transform the Voting Rights Act from a bill into a reality.

This past weekend a group of Republican and Democratic lawmakers traveled to Selma, AL, to join President Obama and former President Bush in honoring those brave Americans who worked tirelessly and at great personal cost to secure equal rights for all citizens regardless of their race. As our Nation thinks about their tremendous patriotism and sacrifice this month, it is a particularly appropriate time to talk about the role Congress can play in safeguarding the hard-won rights of minority voters by working to restore the integrity of the Voting Rights Act.

The oath of office that each of us takes when we become a Senator is to "support and defend the Constitution"—and that means supporting and defending voting rights, which are explicitly enumerated in our U.S. Constitution.

In her dissent in 2013, the Shelby County case, Justice Ginsberg highlighted the legislature's heightened responsibility where the protection of citizens' access to polls is a concern, writing that when it is confronting "the most constitutionally invidious form of discrimination, and the most fundamental right in our democratic system, Congress's power to act is at its height."

Well, over the past 50 years Congress has indeed acted. We have worked on a bipartisan basis to ensure that our citizens do not face discrimination at the polls.

In 1965, in response to a slew of violent attacks against civil rights activists, culminating in the attack on peaceful marchers crossing the Edmund Pettus Bridge, we passed the Voting Rights Act, a bill that aimed to "remedy 95 years of pervasive discrimination in voting rights, which [had] resulted in the almost complete disenfranchisement of minorities in certain areas of the country." That act has been rightfully cited as a "crown jewel" of America's civil rights laws, and for the past 50 years it has expanded minority participation in elections by removing first-generation barriers to ballot access, such as literacy tests and poll taxes. Moreover, the law also helped to tackle so-called second-generation barriers to voting, such as voter ID requirements, elimination or curtailment of early voting, voter registration restrictions, and residency restrictions.

Since the act was passed in 1965, Congress has again and again reaffirmed its commitment to equality in Federal elections by reauthorizing the law in 1970, 1975, 1982, and most recently in 2006 when we voted to extend it for another 25 years. That 2006 vote was not a close one. The bill enjoyed what the press described as "overwhelming bipartisan backing," passing the House by a vote of 390 to 33 and by a Senate vote of 98 to 0. That is pretty persuasive bipartisan backing for taking on the most invidious form of discrimination—discrimination in the right to vote. That vote represented a strong affirmation that equality is not a partisan issue. We can and we have worked together to ensure that all Americans are able to participate in our democracy by exercising their right to vote.

Unfortunately, the U.S. Supreme Court struck down key provisions of the Voting Rights Act 2 years ago in 2013. So now it is once again Congress's duty—our duty—to work together to reform the Voting Rights Act. To anyone who doubts the continued need for a robust Voting Rights Act, I submit the following:

In 2006, while sections 4 and 5 were still in effect, the House Judiciary Committee found that the Voting Rights Act was still a critical tool for countering discrimination. The committee observed that "discrimination today is more subtle than the visible methods used in 1965. However, the ef-

fect and results are the same, namely a diminishing of the minority community's ability to fully participate in the electoral process and to elect their preferred candidates of choice."

That report further found that "despite the substantial progress that has been made" since the Voting Rights Act was first passed in 1965, "the evidence [of discrimination] before the Committee resemble[d] the evidence before Congress in 1965, and the evidence that was present again in 1970, 1975, 1982 and 1992."

The behavior of various States in the aftermath of the 2013 Shelby County ruling highlighted the critical role that sections 4 and 5 played in protecting minority voters. For example, as the Brennan Center for Justice noted on the same day the Supreme Court issued its decision, Texas officials announced it would implement a draconian photo ID law which had been blocked by section 5 because of its racial impact. Initial estimates suggested that it would impact 600,000 to 800,000 registered voters in Texas who did not have a government-issued photo ID.

Texas was not alone. North Carolina quickly enacted a series of laws that drastically restricted voters' access to the polls by imposing a strict photo ID requirement, significantly reducing early voting and limiting the timeframe for voter registration—so three different measures.

It is particularly telling that North Carolina legislators deliberately waited for the Supreme Court to strike down the preclearance requirements of section 5 to propose the legislation, understanding that laws with such a discriminatory effect would likely not pass muster under the Voting Rights Act.

In North Carolina, more than 300,000 registered voters lacked a DMV-issued ID. Of those, one-third were African American.

In 2008, the vast majority of African Americans—70 percent—who voted in North Carolina voted during the early voting period. So North Carolina's significant reduction in early voting was cynically calculated to reduce the turnout of African Americans at the polls.

These States are not alone. The Brennan Center for Justice found that in the aftermath of the Shelby County case, "at least 10 of the 15 states that had been covered in whole or in part by section 5 introduced new restrictive legislation that would make it harder for minority voters to cast a ballot."

Simply put, these States' behavior shows that access to our fundamental right—the right of every citizen to be heard through elections—is suffering in the wake of the Shelby County decision.

We cannot let our civil rights laws return to once again being, as Dr. King said before the passage of the Voting Rights Act, mere "dignity without strength." We owe it to those who sacrificed before us, who sacrificed to

form a more perfect Union, to work together on a bipartisan basis to restore the Voting Rights Act.

I stand ready to work with any of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in this esteemed body to make that happen. I hope every Senator feels the same and understands that access to the polls—the right to vote—is the throbbing heart of a democracy, and without that the democracy is deeply damaged.

Fifty years ago this month, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., said at the foot of the Montgomery capitol: "The battle is in our hands." Today, in Congress, in the U.S. Senate, the battle is in our hands. It is our responsibility to debate and pass such legislation to protect and defend the right to vote for every American.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### REMEMBERING BILLY CASPER

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, today I wish to pay tribute to a hall of fame golfer, a remarkable husband, and a loyal friend—Billy Casper. Last month, Billy passed away peacefully at the age of 83. I know I speak for all who knew him when I say he will be sorely missed.

Billy Casper was a champion both in golf and in life. Between 1956 and 1975, he won 51 tournaments on the PGA tour, including the U.S. Open in 1959 and again in 1966. In 1970, he defeated Gene Littler to capture the Masters in what was the tournament's last 18-hole playoff. During his long and illustrious career, he claimed many titles, including five Vardon Trophies for the low-scoring average that year. He was also a member of eight U.S. Ryder Cup teams and still holds the record for the most Ryder Cup points earned by a U.S. team member. He was inducted into the World Golf Hall of Fame in 1978.

Later in his career, Billy captured nine senior PGA tour wins between 1982 and 1989. I am proud that one of these victories came in Jeremy Ranch, UT—the State Billy adopted as his home.

Billy first came to Utah in 1959 to play in the Utah Open. During that week, he and his wife Shirley fell in love with Utah and eventually relocated permanently. He was an active member of the Utah golfing community and was inducted into the Utah Sports Hall of Fame in 2013.

Since his passing, several professional golfers have offered tributes in honor of Billy's memory. Jack Nicklaus, widely considered the greatest golfer of all time, said the following about Billy:

Billy Casper was one of the greatest family men—be it inside the game of golf or out—I have had the fortunate blessing to meet. He had such a wonderful balance to his life. Golf was never the most important thing in Billy's life—family was. There was always much more to Billy Casper than golf . . . It was not even a year ago, someone asked Billy how he wanted to be remembered, and he said, "I want to be remembered for how I loved my fellow man."

Mike Reid, a fellow PGA Tour competitor and Utahn, said the following about Billy: "He taught by example, that while we strive for excellence in golf, success should never come at the cost of the relationships we hold dear."

To Billy and his wife Shirley, family was always the first priority. They are the proud parents of 11 children, 6 of whom are adopted, and they now have over 70 grandchildren and many great-grandchildren. When his sons were old enough Billy would have them caddie for him on tour so that he could spend that special time with them. He gave freely of himself and spent countless hours in the service of others, both in golf and in church callings.

Billy Casper was one of the very best in his chosen profession, but at the same time, he never let the trappings of the world overshadow what was most important to him—his friends, his faith, and his family. I am profoundly grateful that Elaine and I were able to call Billy and Shirley friends. I will miss Billy Casper dearly, as will all who knew him. May his memory remind us all of the importance of kindness, charity, love, and optimism.

#### RECOGNIZING THE FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST NATIONAL LABORATORY

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, today, with my colleague Senator CANTWELL, we commemorate the 50th anniversary of the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, PNNL, a true example of scientific excellence located in our home State of Washington. For the past 50 years, PNNL has served as the Department of Energy's premier chemistry, environmental sciences, and data analytics national laboratory and has tackled some of our Nation's most complex and urgent challenges.

In 1965, Battelle won a contract to operate a research and development lab at the Hanford Nuclear Reservation in Washington State. Then known as Pacific Northwest Laboratory, its scientists provided critical support to plutonium production and nuclear waste cleanup at Hanford. Through its commitment to excellence and innovation, the lab grew and evolved to serve the ever-changing needs of our Nation. In 1969, the Pacific Northwest Laboratory's scientific prowess caught the eye of NASA, which chose the lab to analyze lunar soil samples that were collected after landing a man on the Moon. The lab changed its name to the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory in 1995, and in 1997 opened the Environ-

mental Molecular Sciences Laboratory. This state-of-the-art national scientific user facility provides researchers from around the Nation and the world with experimental instruments, a high-performance supercomputer, and specialized staff allowing them to advance energy and environmental discoveries.

Today, the lab employs 4,300 people at its main Richland campus, the marine research facility in Sequim, and in satellite offices in Seattle, Tacoma, Portland, and Washington, DC, and conducts \$1 billion in research annually for the Department of Energy, Department of Homeland Security, National Institutes of Health, and many more. While it is clear PNNL serves as a cornerstone of the Tri-Cities economy, the dedicated staff are also key leaders in the community. The lab has made it a priority to invest in STEM education, playing an important role as a founding partner in one of Washington State's first STEM high schools. Delta High School is now educating our next generation of scientists and engineers. In higher education, PNNL supported efforts to create a Washington State University branch campus in the region which led to WSU Tri-Cities opening its doors in 1989. I am consistently impressed with PNNL's contributions to the local community.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I join my colleague, Senator MURRAY, in commemorating the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory's 50th anniversary. As our constituents in Washington State know, PNNL is an integral part of our economy. The lab has a total economic output of \$1.3 billion and supports more than 6,800 jobs in Washington. PNNL's commitment to commercialization and technology transfer has brought research out of the laboratory and into the real world, further bolstering PNNL's reputation as a national scientific leader and supporting Washington State's economy.

I am reminded each day how the work at PNNL impacts our daily lives. During my visits to the Port of Seattle, I know that PNNL has deployed radiation detection systems that keep our ports safe. And when I watch a movie at home, I know that the DVD I use is possible because of PNNL's advancements in digital data storage technology. Because of these and other important contributions, PNNL has earned more Federal Laboratory Consortium Awards than any other national laboratory, holds more than 2,300 U.S. and foreign patents, and fostered the creation of 108 spin-off companies that remain open today.

PNNL plays a unique role in addressing our Nation's energy demands by furthering research in climate change, advanced biofuels, and the electric grid. In the 1990s, the lab helped create the Global Change Assessment Model to help institutions across the world explore the impacts of climate change and the different policy proposals to address it. The scientists at PNNL have also developed a cutting-edge

chemical process that transforms algae to crude oil in minutes, a technology that could help our Nation reduce its dependence on foreign oil. And the lab continues to lead in assessing cyber security threats by developing and testing technology to help protect the electric grid. With its stellar record of commercializing research, I have no doubt that PNNL's work will continue to meet the United States' energy challenges in the future.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, together Senator CANTWELL and I have been proud supporters and advocates for PNNL here in the other Washington, working to make sure our colleagues and the administration understand the important research it conducts, and the significant contributions it makes to the Tri-Cities community. Over the past 50 years, PNNL has benefited from a talented and committed staff of scientists, engineers, and nontechnical staff, a dedicated and committed operator in Battelle, and a strong partner in the Department of Energy. Congratulations to PNNL. I know Senator CANTWELL and I look forward to PNNL's future contributions to Washington State, the Nation, and the world.

#### MULTIPLE SCLEROSIS AWARENESS WEEK

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I wish to express support for Multiple Sclerosis Awareness Week, and to express the need for greater Federal investment in medical research.

I regret that severe weather prevented me from doing this last week, which was Multiple Sclerosis Awareness Week. Multiple Sclerosis Awareness Week is a time for Americans everywhere to help others learn more about multiple sclerosis, and to do what they can to make a difference for those who suffer from this disease.

Multiple sclerosis can be devastating for the individuals who suffer from it, as well as their families. Each year, I am proud to work with Senator COLLINS to recognize multiple sclerosis patients, their caregivers and their families by introducing a resolution in support of Multiple Sclerosis Awareness Week. Senator COLLINS and I worked together again on a resolution for 2015. I am pleased to say that this resolution, S. Res. 98, cleared the Senate on March 4. It is a testament to the support of the Senate for the 400,000 Americans who are estimated to be suffering from this terrible disease.

While it is important to recognize the toll taken by multiple sclerosis, it is just as important to note that it is but one of many debilitating or deadly diseases for which we lack a cure, or for which existing treatments are inadequate. For many of these diseases, we have made great progress due to federally funded biomedical research. Unfortunately, when medical inflation is taken into account, the National Institute of Health's, NIH, budget has been

falling for nearly a decade. This is unacceptable.

We must reverse the decline in NIH funding, and work to support other Federal research programs. The research done by these programs saves lives and improves quality of life. Funding these programs also makes sound economic sense: Federally funded biomedical research is an important driver of economic growth throughout the United States. In 2013, NIH grants to my State alone supported an estimated 23,122 jobs. However, while the United States has been the world leader in medical research, other nations such as China are dramatically ramping up their investment, threatening our dominance in the field. We must work to continue investments that support patients, improve quality of life and create jobs that benefit all Americans.

In addition to advocating for NIH funding with Senator BURR—indicative of the bipartisan support the NIH budget enjoys—I am also a cosponsor of S. 289, the American Cures Act, which would authorize increases in Federal research budgets at the NIH, but also at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the Department of Defense Health Program and the Veterans Medical and Prosthetics Research Program. As we support those suffering from multiple sclerosis, we must also remember the importance of federally funded medical research. We cannot afford, from a public health or economic standpoint, not to support biomedical progress.

#### ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

##### RECOGNIZING THE TENTH ANNIVERSARY OF AUTISM SPEAKS

• Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I wish to acknowledge Autism Speaks as they celebrate 10 years as a leading organization dedicated to serving people with autism and their families. Founded by Bob and Suzanne Wright—concerned grandparents of a child with autism—on February 25, 2005, Autism Speaks has grown to become not just a national leader in the conversation about autism, but a world leader.

Ten years ago, Congress had yet to pass the landmark law now known after two reauthorizations as the Autism CARES Act. The estimated rate of autism in the United States—according to data from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention—at that time was about 1 in 150. Today, the CDC estimates that the rate of autism is about 1 in 68. These same figures show that my home State of New Jersey has the highest rate of autism incidence in the Nation, at 1 in 45. It is because of the countless stories of people from my home State—from the parents seeking help for their children, to the teachers and counselors who help people on the autism spectrum to grow and develop, to the researchers seeking to under-

stand the causes of autism—that I am so passionately committed to confronting the challenge of autism, and Autism Speaks has been a leading voice on this issue for a decade.

Over the past 10 years, Autism Speaks has committed more than \$525 million towards autism research, awareness, services, and advocacy. Most of these funds have gone to support science and medical research, including a new partnership with Google through the MSSNG program, which will sequence and store the world's largest database of genomic information on autism. Autism Speaks has raised awareness of autism worldwide, and has partnerships with organizations in 60 countries across the globe. Autism Speaks provides funds for services for people with autism through a number of grant programs and scholarships. It is also no secret that Autism Speaks has served as a leading advocate in seeking Federal legislation to address the challenges of autism.

I am proud to have championed the passage of the Autism Coordination, Accountability, Research, Education and Support Act, also known as the Autism CARES Act, which passed this body by unanimous consent on July 31, 2014. President Obama signed the Autism CARES Act into law on August 8, 2014. This law ensures that we continue the critical programs established in 2006 that provide for autism research as well as support services to individuals on the autism spectrum and their families. The Autism CARES Act also makes a number of updates and improvements on the original law, starting with better organization and coordination of Federal autism programs, including new mechanisms to ensure that goals are being met and that Federal dollars are being spent efficiently. It also requires that a report be written that focuses on the needs of young adults on the autistic spectrum or with another developmental disability and the challenges they face when they transition from school-based services to those they need during adulthood, which is a critical need that often goes unspoken. Autism Speaks' advocacy on behalf of those with autism and their families was vital to securing overwhelming bipartisan support for this law and ensuring that it passed through Congress and into law.

As they mark their 10th anniversary, I congratulate Autism Speaks for the decade of great work that they do and express my gratitude and support as they serve as a leading voice in our national discussion on autism for decades to come. •

#### TRIBUTE TO DR. WILLIAM MEEHAN

• Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I wish to recognize Dr. William A. Meehan, who has served with great distinction and honor at Jacksonville State University for more than 40 years. I have known him since he became president

in 1999, and my admiration for his leadership and for Jacksonville State University has only grown each year. Dr. Meehan is retiring from his post as president of JSU on June 30, 2015, where his extraordinary leadership and vision will be sorely missed.

Dr. Meehan, along with his board of trustees, set a bold vision for Jacksonville State University. He inspired his team to put students first, to inspire their intellectual curiosity, and to nurture critical thinking, communication skills, and creativity in problem-solving. He led the creation of the university's first bold strategic plan that focuses on 21st-century skills.

President Meehan set a course for JSU that would not only move the university forward but would fast-forward. Now, starting in the fall of 2015, 500 entering freshmen at JSU will have an iPad; these students will have global technology at their fingertips and be prepared for the rigors of their academic pursuits.

Under President Meehan's leadership JSU has excelled in many pursuits. Research funding continues to rise, with more than \$23 million in grants received last year, an increase of 515 percent. ACT scores of incoming freshmen have risen significantly over the past decade, housing occupancy rates have improved from 64 percent to 90 percent, and student-to-faculty ratio is a stellar 17 to 1 under Dr. Meehan's leadership. JSU now enjoys a wide alumni base of more than 60,000 in all 50 States and 95 countries around the world.

President Meehan has focused the university on innovative approaches such as the creation of 12 interdisciplinary centers that yield practical applications and solutions to real-world problems. These centers concentrate on regional education, teaching and learning, security, applied forensics, disaster and community resilience, disease ecology, ecosystems, behavioral studies, economic development, emergency preparedness, environmental policy, and veteran support.

Further, under President Meehan's leadership, JSU was just awarded a 10-year reaffirmation of accreditation by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission of Colleges, SACSCOC. JSU also enjoys significant program accreditations, attesting to the high-quality academics provided. JSU is also fierce on the playing field and lays claim to being the only school in the Nation to hold NCAA national titles in football, men's basketball and baseball at the Division I or Division II levels.

President Meehan has a deep and abiding commitment to partnerships with K-12, community colleges, and the region in which he serves. He has extensive service with community initiatives and on education, economic development and community service strategic boards. His view of education is a seamless process flowing from kindergarten through graduate school,

which results in a high quality talented professional workforce.

In addition to his strong and lasting legacy at JSU, President Meehan prides himself with a loving family. He is married to the former Elizabeth Stevens and is father to twin boys Drew and Will and daughter Carol Grace. President Meehan is a devoted member of the First Baptist Church of Jacksonville, AL.

On April 3, 2015, there will be a community-wide event to honor Dr. Meehan and his family.

On a personal note, I have found President Meehan to be one of Alabama's best university presidents. He is a driving force behind Jacksonville State University's sturdy and solid growth in all areas, from strong increases in academic scores to building on the community's fine reputation. He has been a constant source of information and good advice to me and the State's congressional delegation. He is, as all know, deeply committed to this great university, whose unique character he has further developed. I consider him a personal friend and a valuable advisor.

Please join me in thanking Dr. William Meehan for his tireless dedication to Jacksonville State University and the surrounding community. His exemplary service in higher education is an inspiration, and because of his leadership, JSU is one of the great jewels of Alabama.●

#### RECOGNIZING SKYRUNNER

● Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, American small businesses are cultivating the Nation's brightest minds to innovate with ingenuity. Technological advancement is a crucial element in fostering economic growth, increasing educational opportunities, and retaining high-skilled, technical jobs. Its importance cannot be understated. This week, I am honored to recognize a small business that highlights this exciting aspect of today's economy. Congratulations to this week's Small Business of the Week, Skyrunner, located in Shreveport, LA.

Stewart Hamel and Gilo Cardozo created the Skyrunner in order to reinvent recreational sports vehicles—an all-terrain buggy that also flies. Located in Northwest Louisiana, Skyrunner has combined a recreational off-road vehicle with paragliding equipment that allows the driver to use the machine in either of its two modes: car and flight. When in car mode, the vehicle boasts a rugged, dependable frame ideal for demanding terrains. The flight mode deploys the latest in reflex paragliding technology, allowing the vehicle to float back down to the ground upon entering the air. The vehicle's top speed reaches 115 miles per hour and can accelerate to 62 miles per hour in 4.3 seconds, which can launch the vehicle into the air with minimal effort.

The Skyrunner is more than just a recreational vehicle. With its min-

imum weight and outstanding performance, the Skyrunner has the potential to be incorporated as a valuable tool for various Federal agencies, local and State governments, and adventure enthusiasts alike. CEO Stewart Hamel of Shreveport believes his spin on the all-terrain vehicle will revolutionize the way we manage natural resources, protect Federal lands, aid in natural disasters, and adventure into the wilderness.

When moving its headquarters to Louisiana from the United Kingdom, Skyrunner struggled to get a unique military application approved to import products because a bureaucrat at the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency was blocking the application. Fortunately, I was able to advocate on Skyrunner's behalf to move past bureaucratic red tape, which allowed the company to begin pre-production of their product in Shreveport, LA. With a handful of prototypes under their belt, Skyrunner begins mass production of their aerodynamic dune-buggy within the next few months.

It is important that we cut through government regulations to allow our small businesses to act on innovative ideas and develop their products, market base, and workforce. By supporting these local small businesses, we can bring new technology, jobs, and state-of-the-art equipment to the areas that need it most. Congratulations again to Skyrunner for being selected as Small Business of the Week. I wish you all the best in your endeavor and thank you for bringing innovative technology to Northwest Louisiana.●

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 2:02 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 749. An act to reauthorize Federal support for passenger rail programs, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1213. An act to make administrative and technical corrections to the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995.

The message also announced that pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 6968(a), and the order of the House of January 6, 2015, the Speaker appoints the following Members on the part of the House of Representatives to the Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy: Mr. CUMMINGS of Maryland and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER of Maryland.

#### MEASURES REFERRED

The following bill was read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 749. An act to reauthorize Federal support for passenger rail programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

#### EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-848. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Suspension of Community Eligibility" ((44 CFR Part 64) (Docket No. FEMA-2014-0002)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 3, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-849. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Arizona; Regional Haze State and Federal Implementation Plans; Reconsideration" (FRL No. 9923-88-Region 9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 4, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-850. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Rhode Island; Transportation Conformity" (FRL No. 9924-17-Region 1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 4, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-851. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants: Off-Site Waste and Recovery Operations" (FRL No. 9923-26-OAR) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 4, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-852. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, fourteen (14) reports relative to vacancies in the Department of State, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 3, 2015; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-853. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a section of the Arms Export Control Act (RSAT 14-4215); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-854. A communication from the Report to the Nation Delegation Director, Boy Scouts of America, transmitting, pursuant to law, the organization's 2014 annual report; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-855. A communication from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "ATF 2014 PACT Act Report"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. PAUL (for himself and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 675. A bill to provide for the sealing or expungement of records relating to Federal

nonviolent criminal offenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NELSON (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CARDIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mr. SCHUMER):

S. 676. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to prevent tax-related identity theft and tax fraud, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. BOXER (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. COONS, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. SCHATZ, and Mr. CARDIN):

S. 677. A bill to prohibit the application of certain restrictive eligibility requirements to foreign nongovernmental organizations with respect to the provision of assistance under part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. INHOFE (for himself, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. VITTER, and Mr. SESSIONS):

S. 678. A bill to declare English as the official language of the United States, to establish a uniform English language rule for naturalization, and to avoid misconstructions of the English language texts of the laws of the United States, pursuant to Congress' powers to provide for the general welfare of the United States and to establish a uniform rule of naturalization under article I, section 8, of the Constitution; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself and Mr. THUNE):

S. 679. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to increase access to Medicare data; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BROWN:

S. 680. A bill for the relief of Maha Dakar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself and Mr. DAINES):

S. 681. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify presumptions relating to the exposure of certain veterans who served in the vicinity of the Republic of Vietnam, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

#### ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 134

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the names of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) and the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 134, a bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to exclude industrial hemp from the definition of marihuana, and for other purposes.

S. 153

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 153, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to authorize additional visas for well-educated aliens to live and work in the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 164

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 164, a bill to increase the rates of pay

under the General Schedule and other statutory pay systems and for prevailing rate employees by 3.8 percent, and for other purposes.

S. 178

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the names of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) and the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) were added as cosponsors of S. 178, a bill to provide justice for the victims of trafficking.

S. 236

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 236, a bill to amend the Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 to create an expedited procedure to enact recommendations of the Government Accountability Office for consolidation and elimination to reduce duplication.

S. 257

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 257, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act with respect to physician supervision of therapeutic hospital outpatient services.

S. 259

At the request of Mr. HOEVEN, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. COATS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 259, a bill to modify the efficiency standards for grid-enabled water heaters.

S. 269

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) were added as cosponsors of S. 269, a bill to expand sanctions imposed with respect to Iran and to impose additional sanctions with respect to Iran, and for other purposes.

S. 307

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 307, a bill to amend title III of the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment and implementation of guidelines on best practices for diagnosis, treatment, and management of mild traumatic brain injuries (MTBIs) in school-aged children, and for other purposes.

S. 313

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 313, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to add physical therapists to the list of providers allowed to utilize locum tenens arrangements under Medicare.

S. 314

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 314, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage under the Medicare program of pharmacist services.

S. 316

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr.

BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 316, a bill to amend the charter school program under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

S. 352

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the names of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) and the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) were added as cosponsors of S. 352, a bill to amend section 5000A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an additional religious exemption from the individual health coverage mandate, and for other purposes.

S. 396

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 396, a bill to establish the Proprietary Education Oversight Coordination Committee.

S. 409

At the request of Mr. BURR, the names of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) and the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) were added as cosponsors of S. 409, a bill to amend the Sex Offender Registration and Notification Act to require the Secretary of Defense to inform the Attorney General of persons required to register as sex offenders.

S. 423

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 423, a bill to amend the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act to provide an exception to the annual written privacy notice requirement.

S. 431

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 431, a bill to permanently extend the Internet Tax Freedom Act.

S. 488

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 488, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to allow physician assistants, nurse practitioners, and clinical nurse specialists to supervise cardiac, intensive cardiac, and pulmonary rehabilitation programs.

S. 500

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 500, a bill to amend the Mineral Leasing Act to require the Secretary of the Interior to convey to a State all right, title, and interest in and to a percentage of the amount of royalties and other amounts required to be paid to the State under that Act with respect to public land and deposits in the State, and for other purposes.

S. 539

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED), and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) were



added as cosponsors of S. 539, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to repeal the Medicare outpatient rehabilitation therapy caps.

S. 568

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 568, a bill to extend the trade adjustment assistance program, and for other purposes.

S. 591

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) were added as cosponsors of S. 591, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the new markets tax credit, and for other purposes.

S. 615

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 615, a bill to provide for congressional review and oversight of agreements relating to Iran's nuclear program, and for other purposes.

S. 637

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 637, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and modify the railroad track maintenance credit.

S. 650

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 650, a bill to extend the positive train control system implementation deadline, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 650, supra.

S. 674

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 674, a bill to expand programs with respect to women's health.

S. CON. RES. 4

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 4, a concurrent resolution supporting the Local Radio Freedom Act.

#### AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 269. Mr. PORTMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 178, to provide justice for the victims of trafficking; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 270. Mr. PORTMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 178, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 271. Mr. PORTMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 178, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 272. Mrs. GILLIBRAND submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her

to the bill S. 178, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

#### TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

**SA 269.** Mr. PORTMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 178, to provide justice for the victims of trafficking; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

#### **TITLE \_\_\_\_\_—FAMILY-BASED FOSTER CARE SERVICES**

#### **SEC. \_\_\_\_ INCLUSION OF THERAPEUTIC FOSTER CARE AS MEDICAL ASSISTANCE.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1905 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396d) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (28), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) by redesignating paragraph (29) as paragraph (30); and

(C) by inserting after paragraph (28) the following new paragraph:

“(29) therapeutic foster care services (to the extent allowed and as defined in subsection (ee)); and”;

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(ee)(1) For purposes of subsection (a)(29), subject to paragraphs (3) and (4), the term ‘therapeutic foster care services’ means services provided for children who have not attained age 21, and who, as a result of mental illness, other emotional or behavioral disorders, medically fragile conditions, or developmental disabilities, need the level of care provided in an institution (including a psychiatric residential treatment facility) or nursing facility the cost of which could be reimbursed under the State plan but who can be cared for or maintained in a community placement, through a qualified therapeutic foster care program described in paragraph (2).

“(2) A qualified therapeutic foster care program described in this paragraph is a program that—

“(A) is licensed by the State and accredited by the Joint Commission on Accreditation of Healthcare Organizations, the Commission on Accreditation of Rehabilitation Facilities, the Council on Accreditation, or by another equivalent accreditation agency (or agencies) as the Secretary may recognize;

“(B) provides structured daily activities, including the development, improvement, monitoring, and reinforcement of age-appropriate social, communication and behavioral skills, trauma-informed and gender-responsive services, crisis intervention and crisis support services, medication monitoring, counseling, and case management, and may furnish other intensive community services; and

“(C) provides biological parents, kinship caregivers, and foster care parents with specialized training and consultation in the management of children with mental illness, other emotional or behavioral disorders, medically fragile conditions, developmental disabilities, the impact of trauma on child and caregiver, and specific additional training on the needs of each child provided such services.

“(3) In making coverage determinations in accordance with paragraph (1), a State may employ medical necessity criteria that are similar to the medical necessity criteria applied to coverage determinations for other services and supports under this title.

“(4) For purposes of subsection (a)(29) and this subsection, therapeutic foster care serv-

ices shall not include reimbursement for any training referred to in paragraph (2)(C).”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE; PHASE-IN OF LICENSURE AND ACCREDITATION REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply to medical assistance furnished in calendar quarters beginning on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) PHASE-IN OF LICENSURE AND ACCREDITATION REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall issue guidance to phase-in the application of the licensure and accreditation requirements for qualified therapeutic foster care programs specified in section 1905(ee)(2)(A) of the Social Security Act (as added by subsection (a)) over a 3-year period. Such guidance shall specify that a therapeutic foster care program that is complying with the phase-in requirements for such licensure and accreditation may be considered to be a qualified therapeutic foster care program for purposes of a State receiving payment under section 1903 of the Social Security Act for furnishing medical assistance for therapeutic foster care services provided through such a program if the program also meets the conditions described in subparagraphs (B) and (C) of section 1905(ee)(2) of such Act.

**SA 270.** Mr. PORTMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 178, to provide justice for the victims of trafficking; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

#### **TITLE IV—BETTER RESPONSE FOR VICTIMS OF CHILD SEX TRAFFICKING**

#### **SEC. 401. SHORT TITLE.**

This title may be cited as the “Ensuring a Better Response for Victims of Child Sex Trafficking”.

#### **SEC. 402. CAPTA AMENDMENTS.**

(a) STATE PLANS.—Section 106 of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (42 U.S.C. 5106a) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(2)(B)—

(A) in clause (xxii), by striking “and” at the end; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(xxiv) provisions and procedures requiring identification and assessment of all reports involving children known or suspected to be victims of sex trafficking (as defined in section 103(9)(B) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102 (9)(B)); and

“(xxv) provisions and procedures for training child protective services workers about identifying, assessing, and providing comprehensive services for children who are sex trafficking victims, including efforts to coordinate with State law enforcement, juvenile justice, and social service agencies such as runaway and homeless youth shelters to serve this population;”;

(2) in subsection (d), by adding at the end the following:

“(17) The number of children determined to be victims described in subsection (b)(2)(B)(xxiv).”.

(b) SPECIAL RULE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 111 of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (42 U.S.C. 5106g) is amended—

(A) by striking “For purposes” and inserting the following:

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes”;

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(b) SPECIAL RULE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of section 3(2) and subsection (a)(4), a child shall be considered a victim of ‘child abuse and neglect’ and of ‘sexual abuse’ if the child is identified, by a State or local agency employee of the State or locality involved, as



being a victim of sex trafficking (as defined in paragraph (10) of section 103 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102)) or a victim of severe forms of trafficking in persons described in paragraph (9)(A) of that section.

“(2) STATE OPTION.—Notwithstanding the definition of ‘child’ in section 3(1), a State may elect to define that term for purposes of the application of paragraph (1) to section 3(2) and subsection (a)(4) as a person who has not attained the age of 24.”.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 3(2) of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (42 U.S.C. 5101 note) is amended by inserting (“including sexual abuse as determined under section 111”) after “sexual abuse or exploitation”.

(3) TECHNICAL CORRECTION.—Paragraph (5)(C) of subsection (a), as so designated, of section 111 of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (42 U.S.C. 5106g) is amended by striking “inhumane,” and inserting “inhumane.”.

**SA 271.** Mr. PORTMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 178, to provide justice for the victims of trafficking; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . AMENDMENTS TO THE MCKINNEY-VENTO HOMELESS ASSISTANCE ACT.**

The McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11301 et seq.) is amended—

- (1) in section 103—
  - (A) in subsection (a)—
    - (i) in paragraph (5)(A)—
      - (I) by striking “are sharing” and all that follows through “charitable organizations.”;
      - (II) by striking “14 days” each place that term appears and inserting “30 days”;
      - (III) in clause (i), by inserting “or” after the semicolon;
      - (IV) by striking clause (ii); and
      - (V) by redesignating clause (iii) as clause (ii); and
      - (ii) by amending paragraph (6) to read as follows:
        - “(6) unaccompanied youth and homeless families with children and youth defined as homeless under other Federal statutes who—
        - “(A) are certified as homeless by the director or designee of a director of a program funded under any other Federal statute; or
        - “(B) have been certified by a director or designee of a director of a program funded under this Act or a director or designee of a director of a public housing agency as lacking a fixed, regular, and adequate nighttime residence, which shall include—
        - “(i) temporarily sharing the housing of another person due to loss of housing, economic hardship, or other similar reason; or
        - “(ii) living in a room in a motel or hotel.”;
  - (B) by adding at the end the following:
    - “(f) OTHER DEFINITIONS.—In this section—
    - “(1) the term ‘other Federal statute’ has the meaning given that term in section 401; and
    - “(2) the term ‘public housing agency’ means an agency described in section 3(b)(6) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437a(b)(6)).”;
- (2) in section 401—
  - (A) in paragraph (1)(C)—
    - (i) by striking clause (iv); and
    - (ii) by redesignating clauses (v), (vi), and (vii) as clauses (iv), (v), and (vi), respectively;
    - (B) in paragraph (7)—
      - (i) by striking “Federal statute other than this subtitle” and inserting “other Federal statute”;

(ii) by inserting “of” before “this Act”;

(C) by redesignating paragraphs (14) through (33) as paragraphs (15) through (34), respectively; and

(D) by inserting after paragraph (13) the following:

“(14) OTHER FEDERAL STATUTE.—The term ‘other Federal statute’ includes—

“(A) the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act (42 U.S.C. 5701 et seq.);

“(B) the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. 9831 et seq.);

“(C) subtitle N of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 14043e et seq.);

“(D) section 330(h) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 254b(h));

“(E) section 17 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1786);

“(F) the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.); and

“(G) subtitle B of title VII of this Act.”;

(3) by inserting after section 408 the following:

**“SEC. 409. AVAILABILITY OF HMIS REPORT.**

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The information provided to the Secretary under section 402(f)(3) shall be made publically available on the Internet website of the Department of Housing and Urban Development in aggregate, non-personally identifying reports.

“(b) REQUIRED DATA.—Each report made publically available under subsection (a) shall be updated on at least an annual basis and shall include—

“(1) a cumulative count of the number of individuals and families experiencing homelessness;

“(2) a cumulative assessment of the patterns of assistance provided under subtitles B and C of this title for the each geographic area involved; and

“(3) a count of the number of individuals and families experiencing homelessness that are documented through the HMIS by each collaborative applicant.”;

(4) in section 422—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) by striking “The Secretary” and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary”; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) RESTRICTION.—In awarding grants under paragraph (1), the Secretary may not consider or prioritize the specific homeless populations intended to be served by the applicant if the applicant demonstrates that the project—

“(A) would meet the priorities identified in the plan submitted under section 427(b)(1)(B); and

“(B) is cost-effective in meeting the overall goals and objectives identified in that plan.”; and

(B) by striking subsection (j);

(5) in section 424(d), by striking paragraph (5);

(6) in section 427(b)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) in clause (vi), by adding “and” at the end;

(II) in clause (vii), by striking “and” at the end; and

(III) by striking clause (viii);

(ii) in subparagraph (B)—

(I) in clause (iii), by adding “and” at the end;

(II) in clause (iv)(VI), by striking “and” at the end; and

(III) by striking clause (v);

(iii) in subparagraph (E), by adding “and” at the end;

(iv) by striking subparagraph (F); and

(v) by redesignating subparagraph (G) as subparagraph (F); and

(B) by striking paragraph (3); and

(7) by amending section 433 to read as follows:

**“SEC. 433. REPORTS TO CONGRESS.**

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall submit to Congress an annual report, which shall—

“(1) summarize the activities carried out under this subtitle and set forth the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the Secretary as a result of the activities; and

“(2) include, for the year preceding the date on which the report is submitted—

“(A) data required to be made publically available in the report under section 409; and

“(B) data on programs funded under any other Federal statute.

“(b) TIMING.—A report under subsection (a) shall be submitted not later than 4 months after the end of each fiscal year.”.

**SA 272.** Mrs. GILLIBRAND submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 178, to provide justice for the victims of trafficking; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 95, after line 18, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . FEDERAL CRIMINAL PROCEDURE POST-CONVICTION RELIEF FOR VICTIMS OF TRAFFICKING.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 237 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

**“§ 3772. Motion to vacate; expungement; motion to dismiss**

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

“(1) the term ‘eligible entity’ includes—

“(A) a legal aid society or legal services organization that provides indigent legal services;

“(B) a nonprofit organization that provides legal services to victims of trafficking; and

“(C) a public defender’s office;

“(2) the terms ‘employee’ and ‘officer’ have the meanings given the terms in section 2105 of title 5; and

“(3) the term ‘victim of trafficking’ has the meaning given the term in section 103 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102).

“(b) MOTION TO VACATE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A person convicted of any offense against the United States may move the appropriate district court of the United States to vacate the judgment of conviction if the offense was committed as a direct result of the person having been a victim of trafficking.

“(2) CONTENTS OF MOTION.—A motion described in paragraph (1) shall—

“(A) be in writing;

“(B) describe any supporting evidence;

“(C) state the offense and

“(D) include copies of any documents showing that the movant is entitled to relief under this section.

“(3) HEARING.—

“(A) MANDATORY HEARING.—

“(i) MOTION IN OPPOSITION TO MOTION TO VACATE.—Not later than 30 days after the date on which a motion is filed under paragraph (1), the Government may file a motion in opposition of the motion filed under paragraph (1).

“(ii) MANDATORY HEARING.—If the Government files a motion described in clause (i), not later than 15 days after the date on which the motion is filed, the court shall hold a hearing on the motion.

“(B) DISCRETIONARY HEARING.—If the Government does not file a motion described in subparagraph (A)(i), not later than 45 days after the date on which a motion is filed under paragraph (1), the court may hold a hearing on the motion.

“(4) FACTORS.—The court shall grant a motion under this section if, after notice to and

opportunity for the Government to be heard, the court finds, by a preponderance of the evidence, that—

“(A) the movant was convicted of an offense against the United States; and

“(B) the participation in the offense by the movant was a result of the person having been a victim of trafficking.

“(5) SUPPORTING EVIDENCE.—

“(A) REBUTTABLE PRESUMPTION.—For purposes of this section, there shall be a rebuttable presumption that the movant is a victim of trafficking if the movant includes in the motion—

“(i) a certified copy of an official record of a Federal, State, tribal, or local proceeding, including an approval notice or an enforcement certification generated from a Federal immigration proceeding, that shows that the movant was a victim of trafficking, including a victim of a trafficker charged with a violation of chapter 77; or

“(ii) an affidavit or sworn testimony from a trained professional staff member of a victim services organization, an attorney, a member of the clergy, or a medical or other professional from whom the movant has sought assistance in addressing the trauma associated with being a victim of trafficking.

“(B) OTHER EVIDENCE.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this section, in determining whether the movant is a victim of trafficking, the court may consider any other evidence the court determines is of sufficient credibility and probative value, including an affidavit or sworn testimony of the movant.

“(ii) AFFIDAVIT OR SWORN TESTIMONY OF MOVANT SUFFICIENT EVIDENCE.—The affidavit or sworn testimony of the movant described in clause (i) shall be sufficient evidence to vacate a conviction under this section if the court determines that—

“(I) the affidavit or sworn testimony is credible; and

“(II) no other evidence is readily available.

“(6) CONVICTION NOT REQUIRED.—It shall not be necessary that any person other than the movant be convicted of an offense against the United States before the movant may file a motion under paragraph (1).

“(7) DENIAL OF MOTION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—If the court denies a motion filed under paragraph (1), the denial shall be without prejudice.

“(B) REASONS FOR DENIAL.—If the court denies a motion filed under paragraph (1), the court shall state the reasons for the denial in writing.

“(C) REASONABLE TIME TO CURE DEFICIENCIES IN MOTION.—If the motion was denied due to a curable deficiency in the motion, the court shall allow the movant sufficient time for the movant to cure the deficiency.

“(8) APPEAL.—An order granting or denying a motion to vacate under this section may be appealed in accordance with section 1291 of title 28 and section 3731 of this title.

“(c) EXPUNGEMENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—If the court grants a motion to vacate under subsection (b), the court shall immediately vacate the conviction, set aside the verdict and enter a judgment of acquittal, and enter an expungement order that directs that there be expunged from all official records all references to the—

“(A) arrest of the person for the offense;

“(B) the institution of criminal proceedings against the person; and

“(C) the results of the proceedings.

“(2) EFFECT.—The effect of an order entered under paragraph (1) shall be to restore the person, in the contemplation of the law, to the status the person occupied before the arrest or the institution of the criminal proceedings.

“(d) PRETRIAL MOTION TO DISMISS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A person charged with an offense against the United States may move to dismiss the indictment, information, or complaint if the participation in the offense by the person was a result of the person having been a victim of trafficking.

“(2) APPLICABLE RULES GOVERNING MOTION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A motion described in paragraph (1) shall—

“(i) be deemed to be a motion described in rule 12(b)(3)(B)(v) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure; and

“(ii) except as provided in subparagraph (B), be governed by the rules applicable to that motion.

“(B) RULING ON MOTION.—Notwithstanding rule 12(d) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, the court—

“(i) shall decide a motion under this subsection before trial; and

“(ii) may not defer ruling on the motion until during or after trial.

“(e) ADDITIONAL ACTIONS BY COURT.—The court may, upon granting a motion under this section take such additional action as the court determines is appropriate.

“(f) CONFIDENTIALITY OF MOVANT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A motion under this section and any documents, pleadings, or orders relating to the motion shall be filed under seal.

“(2) INFORMATION NOT AVAILABLE FOR PUBLIC INSPECTION.—No officer or employee may make any report, paper, picture, photograph, court file or other document, in the custody or possession of the officer or employee, that identifies the movant available for public inspection.

“(g) APPLICABILITY.—This section shall apply to any conviction before or on or after the date of enactment of this section.

“(h) GRANT FOR BEST PRACTICES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—On and after the date that is 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, the Attorney General of the United States may make grants to eligible entities to develop, improve, or expand legal services to carry out this section.

“(2) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out this section, including providing organizations and agencies with funds to train legal aid services on motions practices under this section.”

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections of chapter 237 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“3772. Motion to vacate; expungement; motion to dismiss.”

#### APPOINTMENTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair announces, on behalf of the majority leader, pursuant to Public Law 101-509, the reappointment of the following individual to serve as a member of the Advisory Committee on the Records of Congress: Deborah Skaggs Speth of Kentucky.

The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 93-642, appoints the following Senator to be a member of the Board of Trustees of the Harry S. Truman Scholarship Foundation: The Honorable CLAIRE McCASKILL of Missouri.

#### ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, MARCH 10, 2015

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the

Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Tuesday, March 10; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following leader remarks, the Senate be in a period of morning business until 11 a.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the time equally divided, with the majority controlling the first half and the Democrats controlling the second half; further, that at 11 a.m. the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. 178 under the previous order, for debate only, until 12:30 p.m., with the time equally divided; finally, that the Senate recess from 12:30 p.m. until 2:15 p.m. to allow for the weekly conference meetings.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may I say that for many of our States, climate change is a reality and even a daunting one. We look forward to working on the question posed by the Energy and Natural Resources Committee chair: What do we do? But in order to do so we need something from the majority to work with.

With that said, I do not object, and I thank the majority leader for his courtesy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I might say to my friend from Rhode Island, his amendment on climate change was a part of the Keystone bill the President vetoed. I know he and I have very different views about this. What may be challenging for his State is equally challenging in mine. We have a depression in the coalfields of Eastern Kentucky. It is a pretty grim picture. We all know Rhode Island and Kentucky may see this issue quite differently.

#### ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order, following the remarks of Senator BROWN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

# NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD RULE

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to S.J. Res. 8 which was passed by this body earlier last week but without a veto-proof majority. It would protect corporations looking to rig union elections, always at the expense of working families. Our labor movement helped build the middle class and fought for protections so many Americans take for granted: overtime pay brought about because of collective bargaining, child labor laws, collective bargaining, and talking to Members of Congress. Child labor laws, safer workplaces, unemployment insurance, workers compensation were all brought about because people came together in unions to organize and bargain collectively and came together in unions to talk to State legislators and Members of Congress in support of unemployment insurance and in support of safer work laws, child labor laws, and workers' compensation.

I am wearing my lapel with a picture of a canary in a birdcage. It was given to me 20 years ago at a workers' Memorial Day rally in Lorain, OH, a city on Lake Erie, about 25 miles west of Cleveland. This picture illustrates what the mine workers used to do 100 years ago. They took a canary down to the mines. If the canary died from lack of oxygen or toxic gas, the mine worker got out of the mines.

He was on his own. He did not have a union in those days strong enough to protect him. He did not have a government in those days that cared enough to protect him. Since the days of the canary in the birdcage down in the mines, we have seen Congress move forward on workers' compensation, on minimum wage, on unemployment insurance, on prohibition of child labor. Much of that progress, many of those advancements were because of the labor movement.

The growing voice of workers at the table was critical to all of these advances made especially in the early part of the 20th century. Then it was Social Security, then it was Medicare and Medicaid, and then it was all of the other things that helped us together, from Head Start to Pell grants, that helped create a middle class.

The labor movement got children out of the sweatshops and into the classrooms. We expanded the rights of workers, we expanded the rights of women, we expanded the rights of people of color, and prosperity followed, shared by a growing portion of the country.

This week I led a delegation with Senator SCOTT—a Republican from South Carolina—to Selma, AL, and also to Montgomery and Birmingham to mark the 50th anniversary of Bloody Sunday, where the young—mostly students—were nonviolently walking across the Edmund Pettus Bridge in Selma, and they were attacked by State troopers and local police and local deputized citizens of Alabama who participated in the melee and beat

up a number of those students. That got the Nation's attention, and the Nation pushed Congress to pass the Voting Rights Act. Labor unions were there. Labor unions were there to ensure if we work hard and we take responsibility, we can work in a safe environment, with decent wages and benefits that allow us to take care of our family. But over the last decade that has changed. Workers in working families have paid the price. It used to be as profits went up, wages went up with those profits because the workers who helped those companies be profitable shared in the wealth they created.

That is not socialism. That is what happened in American capitalism for decades after World War II. When profits went up, wages went up, in large part because unions at the bargaining table—through the process of collective bargaining—made sure that as their workers were increasingly productive and companies did better and better and executive salaries went up, workers got a piece of the pie. But since the 1970s, profits have gone up, but wages have been pretty stagnant. American workers, our workers, continue to be the most profitable and most productive and talented in the world, but the rewards for productivity gains go to an ever-dwindling number of the richest Americans. So as companies do better and better and stockholders do better and better, as profits go up and up, workers simply have not shared in the wealth they have created. They have not gotten their piece of the pie that they have earned. A big part of that is the decline of the labor movement. Today the middle class accounts for the smallest share of our national income since World War II. I will say that again. The middle class accounts for the smallest share of our national income since World War II.

It is not a coincidence that workers are reaping fewer of the rewards of their work while union membership has declined. That is why the National Labor Relations Board proposed the rule change which is so important and why it is critical that Republican efforts—Republicans, again, doing it on behalf of the largest corporations in America—are not successful. This change would make modest, common-sense reforms to modernize and streamline the election process by which workers form unions.

Right now companies seeking to block workers' rights to form a union can delay elections sometimes up to 2 years, and they can drag out anti-union campaigns, they can intimidate workers, and they can find reasons to fire organizers. Delay works in the corporations' favor, as workers leave the jobs, as workers who wanted the union get discouraged from the union, and delay almost always works on the side of the employer.

Workers have a right to timely elections, the right to make up their own minds free of intimidation. Choosing one's representation is a right we cher-

ish as Americans, and the National Labor Relations Board rule preserves it for our workers. The NLRB rule would cut back on the frivolous court cases these corporations file over and over, these frivolous court cases that companies use to stall elections. It would allow NLRB hearing officers to move forward with an election despite pending litigation, the stalling tactics of frivolous lawsuits to ensure workers aren't silenced by expensive legal battles.

These reforms will not only help workers but also help businesses that act in good faith by streamlining the election process. This isn't an antibusiness move the workers and unions want to engage in, it is a cooperative move because moving quickly will bring everybody to the table more quickly.

Right now the election process varies widely from State to State. It relies on outdated forms of communication. This change will provide certainty to workers and businesses alike and will allow both to file electronically instead of only by mail, saving everyone time and money.

The lobbying effort by corporations on this is opposed to filing electronically. Imagine that. It is 2015. Why do they want to do that? Because they want to slow down the process. We know the consequences. Stalling tactics have real consequences for workers. We have seen that over and over again.

In Massillon, OH—a city near Canton, south of Akron, in Northeast Ohio—nurses at Affinity Medical Center elected to form a union in August 2012. Ann Wyat, who was awarded Nurse of the Year, was fired for leading the activities for unionization. The company did everything it could to crush the unionizing efforts. I have been to that hospital. I have met with those nurses. I have talked to them about this. The NLRB found in favor of the workers, ruling that Affinity Medical refused to bargain and used illegal coercion and intimidation tactics, but still the company refused to comply with Federal labor law. The matter went to Federal court, which ruled in favor of the nurses and filed an injunction against Affinity Medical for failing to follow NLRB rulings, for breaking Federal law.

Last month a jury in a civil court ruled unanimously and awarded the wrongfully terminated nurse \$2 million in damages. It was serious enough what they did to this nurse that the jury ruled this nurse was due \$2 million, not just because of the inconvenience to the nurse and the denial of her rights but the punishment for a company that breaks the law.

Two and a half years later Affinity Medical is still stalling, and no contract has been agreed to. The nurses in Massillon deserve better. All workers deserve better. That is the importance of this NLRB ruling, to make it a more level playing field.

That is what the American labor movement and our commitment to our workers is about—to speak out on behalf of honest pay for an honest day's work. It is a story of a nation—and a government—respecting the dignity of work and reflecting the decency and dedication of workers.

It has been nearly 80 years since American workers' right to collective bargaining has been confirmed. We have been doing this experiment for 80 years. Rather than ending that right—and, with it, squeezing the middle class—we should be working to preserve and expand the rights of workers.

We need equal pay for women, and we need a minimum wage that supports families. The minimum wage is worth 30 percent less today in real purchasing dollars than it was 30 years ago. Rather than eroding that, we need to strengthen and grow the middle class, and we need paid family leave and paid sick leave.

We need to be able to make it a little bit easier for a union, for workers to stand up to corporate interests when workers' interests are not respected.

That should be on the Senate's agenda, but sadly it is not. Instead, we have wasted our time on a resolution that we know will fail—all to pay back political scoring points for those corporations that fund campaigns and continue to dissolve organized labor. Without a veto-proof majority—and the resolution wasn't even close to that last Tuesday—we know it is nothing more than an empty gesture. Just as importantly, we know that if this resolution succeeded, it would do real damage to working Americans by impeding their ability to come together to organize and to build the power they have in numbers to be able to get their fair share of the American dream.

#### EXTENSION OF CHIP FUNDING

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, it has been 1 month since I took to the floor of this body to urge my colleagues to work together to extend funding for the Children's Health Insurance Program, or CHIP. Just this past month, I have held roundtables at almost every major city in Ohio to hear more about what CHIP means to people in Ohio. At each of these roundtables, I spoke with families who depend on CHIP to get their kids the care they need.

Please understand that there are 130,000 Ohio children who are eligible for CHIP and who have benefited from CHIP, and in almost every case they are the sons and daughters of parents

who work. These are parents who don't make enough money and don't work at a place where the employer provides insurance. They may be \$9, \$10, \$11 or \$12 an hour jobs. They are working, and the income they are making simply isn't enough to buy insurance for their kids and for their families. So that is the importance of rewarding work. These 130,000 children now have insurance because of a bipartisan bill, the Children's Health Insurance Program. They have had it for 20 years.

It is in jeopardy now. Last week I was at the John R. Maloney Health Center in Columbus, where more kids rely on CHIP than anywhere else in the State. Some 13,000 children in Franklin County alone have health coverage because of CHIP.

I spoke with Meredith Mendoza, a mother living in Gahanna, OH. She works full time as a medical interpreter and makes too much to qualify for Medicaid but not quite enough to afford health insurance, and her employer doesn't provide it. Three of her four children have affordable, comprehensive coverage because of CHIP.

CHIP provides a sigh of relief for parents such as Meredith because CHIP means better access to comprehensive care for their children. Providing health insurance to low-income children isn't just the right thing to do; it is the smart thing to do.

This is why it is the smart thing to do. It allays the anxiety that so many families have about one of their children getting sick. It helps families feel more secure that they won't be wiped out financially and in other ways by a sick child. It helps that child do better in school because the child will miss fewer days and the child will feel better. It gives that child preventive care. It means vaccines, preventive health care, getting physicals, and it means dental care. It means better performance in school. CHIP means all of that.

But the problem is that the CHIP law is until 2019. We authorized it a couple years ago. The funding runs out in September. My Governor, the Republican Governor of Ohio, wants to see us fund CHIP through 2019 so we can continue to provide this insurance to all 130,000 children in my State.

If we don't act now, States will have to assume that CHIP is expiring, as they go through their budget process. In other words, CHIP funding runs out in September, but States—through their legislative process, where fiscal years often end during the early or mid-summer—need to begin to work this through their budgets right now.

The Utah legislature adjourns this week, March 12; New Mexico, March 21; Idaho, April 3; Tennessee, April 17; Alaska, April 19; Iowa, April 21; and Montana, April 27. All but seven State legislatures adjourn before September. That makes the need to act even more dire.

That is why I was proud to introduce legislation last month called the Protecting And Retaining Our Children's Health Insurance Program Act, or PRO-CHIP. It has been endorsed by every children's hospital in Ohio, almost all of them around the country, several national groups—the March of Dimes, the American Academy of Pediatrics, the Children's Hospital Association, Families USA—all kinds of people, and all kinds of groups.

CHIP just makes sense. Protecting health coverage, protecting health insurance, and providing health insurance to low-income children isn't just the smart thing to do; it is the right thing to do.

I call on my colleagues to pass the CHIP refunding bill so that it doesn't run out in September. Then States can plan so we can provide the health insurance to 10 million children—almost all of whose parents work for a living and who simply don't make enough money to provide insurance for their families.

I yield the floor.

#### ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate stands adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 7:04 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, March 10, 2015, at 10 a.m.

#### CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 9, 2015:

##### EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

DANIEL HENRY MARTI, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ENFORCEMENT COORDINATOR, EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT.

##### DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

MICHELLE K. LEE, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF COMMERCE FOR INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY AND DIRECTOR OF THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE.

##### FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

JEFFERY S. HALL, OF KENTUCKY, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION BOARD, FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION, FOR A TERM EXPIRING OCTOBER 13, 2018.

DALLAS P. TONSAGER, OF SOUTH DAKOTA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION BOARD, FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION, FOR A TERM EXPIRING MAY 21, 2020.